




**UC-NRLF**




**\$B 264 199**











Collins' School and College Classics.

---

G U I D E

TO

CHAUCER AND SPENSER.

BY

F. G. F L E A Y,

AUTHOR OF 'THE SHAKESPEARE MANUAL.'

May.



REESE LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF  
CALIFORNIA.

LONDON AND GLASGOW:  
WILLIAM COLLINS, SONS, AND CO.

1877.

[All rights reserved.]

A26  
F5

63333



F5  
1877

MAI

## CONTENTS.

---

### PART I.

#### GUIDE TO CHAUCER.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION, . . . . .	9

#### CHAPTER I.

LIFE OF CHAUCER, . . . . .	II
----------------------------	----

#### CHAPTER II.

NOTES ON THE SOURCES OF CHAUCER'S WORKS, . . . . .	16
--	----

#### CHAPTER III.

CHAUCER'S LANGUAGE, . . . . .	21
-------------------------------	----

#### CHAPTER IV.

CHAUCER'S WORKS AND THEIR CHRONOLOGY, . . . . .	29
---	----

#### CHAPTER V.

CHAUCER AND SKOGAN, . . . . .	43
-------------------------------	----

#### CHAPTER VI.

ON THE ORDER IN WHICH THE 'CANTERBURY TALES' WERE WRITTEN, . . . . .	53
---	----

## CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
ON THE ORDER IN WHICH CHAUCER'S 'CANTERBURY TALES' SHOULD BE ARRANGED, . . . . .	66
EDITIONS OF CHAUCER'S WORKS, . . . . .	72

---

## PART II.

## GUIDE TO SPENSER.

INTRODUCTION, . . . . .	75
-------------------------	----

## CHAPTER I.

LIFE OF SPENSER, . . . . .	77
----------------------------	----

## CHAPTER II.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY, ETC., OF SPENSER'S WORKS, . . . . .	82
--	----

## CHAPTER III.

ON POETS CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH SPENSER AND SHAKESPEARE, . . . . .	100
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES, . . . . .	117
LIST OF EDITIONS OF SPENSER'S WORKS, . . . . .	120

---


AFTER-WORDS ON THE STUDY OF THE OLDER ENGLISH POETS AND DRAMATISTS, . . . . .	121
--	-----

**Part II.**



**GUIDE TO CHAUCER.**





# GUIDE TO CHAUCER.



## INTRODUCTION.

THE reasons for the publication of this *Guide* are the following :

1. There is no accessible trustworthy work on the subject at a moderate price.
2. The information necessary for a student of Chaucer is scattered through a number of works, some expensive, some of small intrinsic value, some difficult to obtain.
3. The valuable additions to our critical knowledge of Chaucer, made of late years by Messrs Bradshaw, Skeat, Morris, Furnival, Lowell, Ten Brink, and others, have been so overlaid with premature conclusions and insufficiently founded hypotheses, as to rhyme-tests, hopeless early love, and other matters, that it is needful to recall students to a juster appreciation of the value of the old traditions, and to vindicate the Chaucerian authorship of some of the rejected writings.
4. The received hypotheses as to the chronology of the poems seem capable of improvement in various ways.

Of course, in so small a work, it cannot be expected that all these ends have been fully attained. I hope, however, that some advance has been made toward their attainment ; and that a scheme has been laid down for the order of study of these works which is practicable and desirable. It has been in no way my intention to infringe on the duties of the editor or commentator on Chaucer, but to give such information as can properly be given, apart from the consideration of any special poem or particular passages of poems ; so that by the help of a glossary (which can be found in most editions), a sound treatise on English grammar, such as Dr Morris's *Historical Accidence*, and a good text, such as that

in Wright's *Canterbury Tales*, or Morris's *Complete Works* of our author, no further aid should be needful for any student who desires a sound, but not a specially critical acquaintance with our earliest and our all but greatest poet. Of the need of such an acquaintance for every one who wishes for a knowledge of English literature, it is useless to say a word; of the practicability of acquiring it at the age of thirteen or thereabouts, I have had many proofs among my own pupils, from the time when I first introduced English literature as a specific subject of education in our grammar schools, now twenty years ago. The methods I was then almost, if not quite, alone in using, are now in general practice, and I am desirous of continuing to aid their diffusion by the publication of this manual. It is the result (however imperfect) of continued and long study, and if it gives anything like the same advantage to the reader that its production has to the author, it will more than answer its design.



## CHAPTER I.

### LIFE OF CHAUCER.

*No*

GEOFFREY CHAUCER, son of John Chaucer, vintner, of Thames Street, London and Agnes his wife, was born, according to Speght, in 1328. There is no sufficient reason for rejecting this statement, yet it has been rejected on the ground of a deposition made by Chaucer in 1386, when cited as a witness in a cause of chivalry between Lord Scrope and Sir Richard Grosvenor. He there stated that he was 'of xl years and upwards, armed for xxvii years.' But Sir Harris Nicolas has shown that in the ages of other deponents remarkable mistakes have been made, 'some of them being stated to have been ten, and others even twenty years younger than they really were.' Moreover, Gower speaks of him in 1392 as 'now in his days old.' Occleve calls him 'father reverent.' Chaucer says himself that he is 'old and un lusty.' And Leland tells us he 'lived to the period of grey hairs, and at length found old age his greatest disease.' The evidence of his portraits in the Harleian MSS. and Royal MSS., confirms this testimony. The wish has, I fear, been father to the thought in this matter. The desire to reject as spurious several early poems on insufficient and wrongly interpreted metrical data, has led to a setting aside of strong external and internal evidence.

1357-9. We have, however, no details of Chaucer's life beyond this traditional date of his birth, till we find his name in the Household Book of Elizabeth, Countess of Ulster, the wife of Lionel, son of Edward III. In what capacity Chaucer formed part of her household is absolutely unknown. But in the autumn of 1359 he was fighting in France in Edward III's army, and was taken prisoner. He was ransomed in 1360 (on 1st March Edward III ordered £16 to be paid toward his ransom), and returned to England on the conclusion of the peace of Chartres in that year. The date of his marriage has been doubted, as well as that of his birth, probably to strengthen the hypothesis that *Chaucer's Dream* is not authentic. What other poet could have written this thoroughly Chaucerian production does not appear. To

support this remarkable hypothesis, we are desired to assume that Chaucer married his cousin and namesake. There can be no doubt, however, in any unprejudiced mind that Chaucer's wife was Philippa Roet, daughter of Sir Payne Roet of Hainault, Guienne King of Arms, who came to England in Queen Philippa's retinue in 1328. In 1366 the queen granted Philippa Chaucer a pension of ten marks, which was confirmed by Edward III on the queen's death in 1369. At that date she passed to the household of Constance, the second wife of John of Gaunt. At this period Philippa's sister, Katherine, widow of Sir Hugh Swynford of Lincolnshire, was governess to the duke's children by his first duchess. She became the duke's mistress, and ultimately his wife. Meanwhile Chaucer was appointed in 1367 one of the valets of the king's chamber, and in the same year was granted an annual salary for life of twenty marks till he should be otherwise provided for. In this grant he is called 'dilectus Valettus noster,' which title, says Selden, 'was conferred on young heirs designed to be knighted, or young gentlemen of great descent or quality.'

In 1370 (spring) Chaucer was abroad on the king's service, but returned at Michaelmas.

On 30th August 1372, the Duke of Lancaster gave Philippa Chaucer a pension of £10 a year; which is stated by Sir Harris Nicolas to have been commuted in June 1374, for a life annuity to her and her husband. On 12th November in the same year, he, as *scutifer regis*, was joined in commission with two citizens of Genoa, to treat with the duke, citizens, and merchants of that state, as to choosing some port in England where the Genoese might form a commercial establishment. On 1st December he got £66, 13s. 4d. advanced on account of his expenses, and left England for Florence and Genoa, on the king's business. He returned before 22d November 1373, having possibly met Petrarch at Padua, in the interim (see the *Clerk's Tale*).

On 23d April 1374 (St George's Day), a writ was issued at Windsor, granting a pitcher of wine daily for life to 'dilecto armigero nostro Galfrido Chaucer.' On 8th June he was appointed comptroller of the customs and subsidy of wools, skins, and tanned hides in the port of London. He was to write the rolls of his office with his own hand, to be constantly present, and to perform the duties of his office personally, not by deputy. On the 13th June the pension granted to Philippa Chaucer in 1372 was commuted for one to Chaucer for the good service rendered by him *and his wife*.

to the Duke of Lancaster, his consort, and his mother the queen. On 10th May 1374, he took a lease of a house above the gate of Algate, from Adam de Bury, mayor, the aldermen, and commonalty of the city.

In 1375, on 8th November, he obtained a grant of the custody of lands and person of Edmond Staplegate, of Bilsynton, Kent, who three years after paid Chaucer £104 for his wardship and marriage. On 28th December he had also a grant of the custody of five solidates of rent and marriage of an infant heir, aged one year, William de Solys, of Solys, in Kent. On 23d December 1376, he was paid ten marks for secret service in the retinue (*comitiva*) of Sir John Burley; and on 12th February 1377, letters of protection were granted him till Michaelmas to go abroad with Sir Thomas Percy on a secret mission to Flanders. He was back by 11th April; and on 20th April he again had letters of protection granted him till 1st August, while in the king's service abroad. On 30th April he was paid £26, 12s. 4d. for wages for a secret mission, *versus partes Francie*—namely, to negotiate a peace with the French king—to Moustrell et Parys. We find also in this year that his daily pitcher of wine, granted in 1374, was commuted for a money payment of about 7d. a day, a large sum at that time. On 21st June Edward III died.

On 16th January 1378, Chaucer went to France to negotiate a marriage with Mary, the French king's daughter (see *Parlament of Foules*). We learn this from Froissart's statement, that he accompanied Sir Guichard d'Angle and Sir Richard Sturry on this embassy, together with the entry of payment to him on 6th March 1381, 'per manus proprios per assignationem sibi factam isto die,' as well for his journey in 1377, 'quam tempore domini regis nunc causa locutionis habite de maritagio inter ipsum dominum regem nunc et filiam ejusdem adversarii sui Francie.' Froissart's assigning a wrong date (February 1377) does not invalidate his evidence as to the fact. In the year after the accession of Richard II, Chaucer's pension of 20 marks was confirmed (March 23), and 20 marks additional were granted him in lieu of his daily pitcher of wine.

On the 10th May he was sent with Sir Edward Berkley to Lombardy, on a mission to Bernardo Visconti, Lord of Milan (see *Monk's Tale*), and to Sir John Hawkwood, concerning Richard II's expedition of war. On 21st May, having to leave two representatives to appear for him in the court, he selected Richard Forester and John Gower, the poet, who was nearly of the same age as himself, and probably his

friend through the greater part of his career. By 3d February 1379 he had returned to England.

On 1st May 1380, Cecilia Champagne releases Chaucer 'de raptu meo.' The meaning of these words is very doubtful. It is, however, certain that as Cecilia Champagne executed the release herself she could not have been a minor. Hence this was not a case of abduction of a ward. Neither was it a criminal charge, for there is no trace in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* of a pardon from the Crown, and if Chaucer had been acquitted by a jury, this release would not have been needed; nor indeed in such a charge would she have stated her parentage as she does in her deed of release. It was a civil suit, involving no felony. On 19th June, in the same year, Geoffrey Chaucer, son of John Chaucer, vintner, released to Henry Herbury all his right to his father's former house in Thames Street.

Nothing more is known of him, except that he received his pensions by assignment or personally, and that his wife received sundry gilt cups from the Duke of Lancaster, until 8th May 1382, when he was appointed comptroller of the petty customs in the port of London, in addition to his former office. He was allowed to perform his duties by deputy. Accordingly on 13th November 1384, he obtained a month's leave of absence from his comptrollership of customs and subsidies on account of his private affairs. A temporary deputy was then sworn in to execute his duties, and on 17th February 1385 a permanent deputy was nominated.

In 1386 we find him taking part in politics; he sat in Parliament at Westminster from 1st October to 1st November as one of the knights of the shire for Kent. He no doubt supported the then minister, his patron the Duke of Lancaster. But he was ousted from office by the Duke of Gloster, and probably Chaucer had to share in his patron's downfall. In November a commission was issued to inquire into alleged abuses in the subsidies and customs: on 4th December, Adam Yerdely was appointed comptroller in place of Geoffrey Chaucer dismissed. During Chaucer's sitting in the House, on 15th October he gave his evidence as a witness for Lord Scrope already referred to, stating that he saw Sir Richard armed in France before the town of Retters, and during the whole expedition until the said Geoffrey was taken.

In June 1387 we find the last payment of Philippa Chaucer's pension. She probably died before December in that year.

On 1st May 1388, his pensions, cancelled at his request, were assigned to John Scalby, to whom he had likely sold them.

On 12th July 1389, he was appointed Clerk of the King's Works at Westminster, the Tower, the royal manors of Kennington, Eltham, Clarendon, Sheen, By-fleet, Childern, Langley, and Feckenham; the lodges at the New Forest, and the royal parks, and at the mews for the king's falcons at Charing Cross. He was allowed two shillings a day, and to execute his office by deputy. The appointment to this important post was no doubt a result of the coming into power of new ministers (one of them the son of the Duke of Lancaster), in the place of Thomas of Woodstock, Walsingham, etc., in May 1389. Chaucer at once commenced his duties, and in July 1390 was commissioned to procure workmen and materials to repair St George's Chapel at Windsor. On 22d January 1391, Chaucer appointed, and Richard II confirmed the appointment of John Elmhurst as deputy for doing repairs to the Palace of Westminster, and the Tower of London. But by 16th September in the same year, we find that Chaucer had ceased to fill this post, and that John Gedney was in possession of it. We lose sight of Chaucer from that date till 28th February 1394, when the king granted him £20 a year for life. But in spite of this we find him continually borrowing loans on the security of his new pension, some of them for very small sums, until on 4th May 1398 he got of the king letters to protect him against arrest for two years. On 15th October in the same year, he had another grant of wine, one tun yearly from 1st December 1397, worth about £4.

On 3d October 1398, the new king, Henry IV, son of Chaucer's former patron now deceased, granted him 40 marks a year in addition to the £20 he held from Richard II.

On Christmas Eve 1399, he entered on the lease of a house in Westminster for a term of fifty-three years at £2, 13s. 4d. per annum. The tenement was situated in the garden of the Chapel of the Blessed Mary. It was stipulated that if the tenant died during the term of the lease the premises should revert to the custos of the chapel. On the 24th October 1400, they reverted; and Chaucer, aged seventy-two, was buried in Westminster Abbey. He left a son Thomas: his other son Lewis probably died young.

The character of our greatest narrative poet is best studied in his works: it needs no comment here. It is enough to say that as no other man has told a story in English verse with equal terseness or humour, the name of Chaucer still holds a place alone in the list of English poets that remain unforgotten and unforgettable.

## CHAPTER II.

### NOTES ON THE SOURCES OF CHAUCER'S WORKS.

#### *Romaunt of the Rose.*

Translated from the *Roman de la Rose*, written by Guillaume de Lorris (lines 1-4070), and Jean de Meun (the other 18,000 lines). Chaucer's version (7699 lines) is confined to lines 1-13,105 of the original, and passes over 5544 of these. Whether we have the whole of Chaucer's work is doubtful.

#### *Death of Blanche (Book of the Duchess).*

Partly from the *Dit de la Fortune Amoreuse* of Machault.

#### *Second Nun's Tale (Cecilie).*

Translated from the *Legenda Aurea (Treatises on Church Festivals)*, by Jacobus a Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa in the thirteenth century. Chaucer prefixed the opening address to the Virgin. For the passages in Dante and Boccaccio imitated by Chaucer in this and other works of his second period (1374-1382), see Professor Ten Brink's *Studies of Chaucer*.

#### *Prioress' Tale (Little Clergeoun and Jews).*

Compare the ballad of the *Jew's Daughter* in the *Percy Reliques*.

#### *Man of Law's Tale (Constance).*

The incidents are traced by Wright to several romances: *Emare*, *Chevalier au Cigne*, *King Offa*, *Roman de la Violette*, *Le Bone Florence de Rome*, *Vincent de Beauvais*, and *Gesta Romanorum*. It was not taken from Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, as this was not written till 1392.

#### *Clerk's Tale (Grisildis).*

Boccaccio, Day x, Novel 10.

*Assembly of Fowls (Parliament of Birds).*

Partly founded on a *fabliau* that occurs in three versions: *Hueline et Eglantine*, *Le Jugement d'Amour*, and *Florence et Blancheflor*.

*Complaint of Mars.*

The poem applies in its surface-meaning to the conjunctions of the planets Mars and Venus; but in its under application it represents the intrigue between the Lord Huntingdon and the Duchess of York, who was aunt of his wife, Elizabeth. Hence the allusion in it to the brooch of Thebes, which inspired its possessor with incestuous or ill-omened passion. Lydgate distinguishes this poem as made—

‘ Of the broche which that Vulcanus  
At Thebes wrought.’

*Of Queen Annelyda and False Arcite.*

Statius and Corinna are quoted by Chaucer as his authorities. No poems of Corinna's are extant, and the only part from Statius is the early part relating to Theseus.

Opens very like the *Knight's Tale*.

*Troylus and Cryseyde.*

Chaucer refers to Homer, Dares Phrygius, Dictys Cretensis, and Lollius as his authorities. The earliest known source of the story is the prose chronicle of Guido de Colonna in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Chaucer was not ignorant of Guido. He mentions him in the *House of Fame*. So he does Lollius, and assigns him a place on the same pillar as Homer. Lydgate says that Chaucer translated this poem from the *Trophe* of Lollius. The poem is really taken from the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio, with great variations. W. Rosetti has shown that *Trophe* and *Filostrato* mean the same thing.

Dedicated in *Envoy* to moral Gower and philosophical Strode.

*Doctor's Tale (Virginius).*

Other versions (besides Livy's) will be found in the *Roman de la Rose* and Gower's *Confessio Amantis*.

*Legend of Good Women.*

Also called the *Saints' Legend of Cupid*, contains sketches of ten out of twenty ladies who are proposed as subjects at the beginning of the poem. These ten are taken almost entirely from Ovid's *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*. In the following list the names in the first column are those that Chaucer actually wrote; those in the second are probably the remaining ten that he intended to write. The prefixed numeral shows their position in Ovid's *Heroides*; *P.* after a name indicates that it is mentioned in the prologue to the *Man of Law's Tale*; *L.* that it is enumerated in the prologue to the *Legend*.

Cleopatra, I..	I. Penelope, P.L.
Thisbe, L.	13. Laodamia, P.L.
7. Dido, P.L.	17. Helen, P.L.
6. Hypsipyle, P.L. }	19. Hero, P.L.
12. Medea, P.L. }	3. Briseis, P.
Lucretia, L.	8. Hermione, P.
10. Ariadne, P.L.	9. Deianeira, P.
Philomene.	Polyxena, L.
2. Phyllis, P.L.	5. Cœnone.
14. Hypermnestra, P.L.	13. Alcestis, P.

Phædra, Canace, Sappho, and Cydippe are the other names mentioned by Ovid, which cannot be included in this list.

There is also included in this poem an (incomplete) enumeration of Chaucer's previous work, which it is desirable to put in tabular form for reference:

Romaunt of Rose.
House of Fame.
Death of Blanche the Duchess.
Troylus and Cryseide.
Parlement of Fowls.
Loves of Palamon and Arcite ( <i>Knight's Tale</i> ).
Translation of Boethius.
Life of Saint Cecilia ( <i>Second Nun's Tale</i> ).
Origenes on the Magdalene.
Ballads.
Roundels.
Virelaies.
Many a Lay, and Many a Thing.

The avowed intention of the *Legend* is to atone for the scandal thrown on women in the *Romaunt of the Rose* and *Troylus and Cryseyde*.

*Squire's Tale (Cambynskan).*

Incomplete. A fuller version seems to have existed in Henry VII's time; for Hawes, in his *Temple of Glass*, says:

'And uppermore men depeinten might see  
 How with her ringe goodly Canace  
 Of every fowl the ledene and the song  
 Could understand as she them walkt among,  
*And how her brother so often holpen was*  
*In his mischefe by the steed of brass.'*

*Nun's Priest's Tale (Chanticlere).*

From the *Roman de Renart*, chap. v, 'Si comme Renart  
 Prist Chantecler le Coc.' Compare *Fable 51* in the collection  
 translated by Marie from King Alfred.

*Manciple's Tale (Phæbus and White Crow).*

From Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, book ii.

*Wife of Bath's Tale (Knight and Foul Wife).*

Compare the story of *Florent* in Gower and the marriage  
 of Sir Gawaine in the *Percy Reliques*.

*Merchant's Tale (January and May).*

From a Latin fable by Adolphus (1315), probably through  
 some French *fabliau*.

*Shipman's Tale (Dan Johan and Merchant).*

Boccaccio's *Decameron*, Day viii, Novel 1.

*Reeve's Tale (Miller of Trumpington).*

From a *fabliau* pointed out by Mr Wright. Compare Boc-  
 caccio's *Decameron*, Day ix, Novel 6; and 'De Gombert et  
 des Deux Clercs' in *Barbazan*.

*Friar's Tale (Sompnour and Devil).*

Compare *De Advocato et Diabolo* (Percy Society's edition),  
 and a similar story in Wright's *Archæologia*.

*Pardoner's Tale (Three Rioters).*

Cento *Novelle Antiche*, Novel 82.

*Treatise on the Astrolabe.*

Written for the use of Chaucer's son, Lewis, aged eleven.

*Tale of Melibæus.*

Translated from *Le Livre de Mélibée et de Dame Prudence* in French prose.

*Monk's Tale (Harm of Them in High Degree).*

Partly from Boccaccio, *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium*, but with these exceptions: Lucifer is from *Isaiah*, xlv, 12-15; Samson from *Judges*, xiv-xvi; Hercules from Boethius, lib. iv, met. vii; Nabuchodonosor from *Daniel*; Zenobia from Boccaccio, *De Claris Mulieribus* (Chaucer quotes Petrarch as his authority); Nero from *Roman de la Rose* and Boethius, lib. ii, met. vi (Chaucer quotes Suetonius as his authority); Holofernes from *Judith*; Antiochus from *2 Macabees*, ch. ix; Alexander the Great from the same source; Julius Cæsar from Lucan, Suetonius, and Valerius Flaccus; Croesus from *Roman de la Rose* and Boethius, b. ii, pro. 2 (in his own translation). Pedro, and other recent characters also, are not in Boccaccio.

*Chaucer's A.B.C. (La Prière de Nostre Dame).*

Translated from *De Guilleville*.

*Complaint of Venus.*

Translated 'word for word' from Graunson.

**LIST OF WORKS GENERALLY REJECTED AS SPURIOUS,  
BUT FORMERLY ATTRIBUTED TO CHAUCER.**

*Court of Love* (Query by Skogan).

*Reward of Love.*

*Lamentation of Mary Magdalene.*

*Complaint of Black Knight* (Lydgate).

*Flower and Leaf* (by a Lady).

*Cuckow and Nightingale.*

*Godly Ballad.*

*Praise of Women.*

*Chaucer's Prophecy.*

'*Leäulté vault*', etc.

*Rondel.*

*Virelai.*

## CHAPTER III.

### CHAUCER'S LANGUAGE.

### PRONUNCIATION.

MR ELLIS'S investigations on this subject are so complete and convincing that it will only be necessary here to give the results he has attained :

#### SHORT VOWELS.

i (y)	was sounded like	i	in finny.
ē	"	"	e in met.
ā	"	"	a in cask.
ō	"	"	o in not (nearly).
ū	"	"	u in pull; rarely like i, ē.

#### LONG VOWELS AND DIPHTHONGS.

i was sounded like i in still (drawled long).

ea	}	" " "	ai in chair.
ee			
eo	}	" " "	ai in Isaiah.
oe			
ie	}	" " "	a in father.
e			
ai (ay)	{	" " "	ow in know.
ei (ey)			
a	{	" " "	oo in boot.
aa			
au (aw)	{	" " "	oo in Europa (Italian).
o			
oo	{	" " "	ui in suit (nearly).
ou (ow)			
oi (oy)	{	" " "	ui in suit (nearly).
ai (ay)			
u	{	" " "	eu in Europa (Italian).
eu (ew)			

Final *e* is elided before vowels, silent *h*'s, his, he, her, etc.; not pronounced in *hire*, *here*, *oure*, *youre*; rarely sounded in *hadde*.

It is necessary also to notice specially when *e* final is pronounced, as many of the editions and sometimes the MSS. are incorrect in their grammar. I give therefore the following table compiled from Dr Morris:

Final *e* (when sounded) in monosyllables represents in—

<i>Nouns.</i>	<i>Adjectives.</i>	<i>Adverbs.</i>	<i>Verbs.</i>
1. A.S. final vowel, <i>i</i> , <i>a</i> , <i>u</i> , <i>e</i> .	1. Definite form.	1. Older ending.	1. Infinitive mood.
2. Final French unaccented <i>e</i> .	2. Plural.	2. -en.	2. Gerundive.
3. Dative inflexion.	3. Vocative.	3. Adverbial termination.	3. Past participle (strong verbs). 4. Past tense (weak verbs). 5. Subjunctive mood.

On the consonants it is only necessary to remark that: *f* was never sounded like *v*, as in modern *of*.

*gh* retained its guttural sound as in *lough*, never taking sound of *f* as in *cough*.

-*cion*, -*sion*, -*tion*, and similar terminations, such as -*tience*, etc., were sounded *si-on*, not *shion*, still less *shun* as at present.

It should also be noticed that in words of French extraction, the accent follows the French (tonic) accent thus: *licoûr*, *corâge*, etc.

## GRAMMAR.

The following sketch of Chaucer's grammatical forms will be sufficient for the student who does not intend to extend his studies to older English. He who does, will, of course, take up Dr Morris's *Historical Outlines*, or Koch's *Historische Grammatik*.

## INFLEXIONS.

### *Nouns.*

*Number.*—I. The plural is usually formed by -*es*, as *drop*, *dropes*, in monosyllables not ending in *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*.

Some MSS. give us *-is*, *-us*, instead of *-es*. Both these variations are probably due merely to differences of dialect.

2. Some nouns retain the old plural in *-(e)n*, as *eyen* (eyes), *hosen* (hose), *doughteren* (daughters).

3. Some few nouns (in addition to such words as *deer*, *swine*, etc., in which the modern usage coincides with the old), take no termination in the plural, as *hors*, *thing*.

*Case*.—1. The possessive ending in *-ēs*, as *lordēs*.

2. Some nouns take no genitive inflexion in certain phrases; for example, *Fader soul*, *brother son*, *daughter name*, *lady grace*, *hertē blood*, *sonne uprist*, are quoted by Morris.

3. We sometimes meet with a dative in *ē*, as *beddē*.

4. A genitive plural in *-en* occurs but rarely, as *eyghen* (of eyes).

### *Adjectives.*

*Form*.—The adjective if monosyllabic, when preceded by a demonstrative pronoun (including under this class, the definite article), or a possessive pronoun, or the vocative *O*, takes a final *ē*; this is called the definite form of the adjective, thus: *rightē*, *scharpē*. Sometimes words of more than one syllable follow the same rule.

*Comparison*.—1. Comparative *-er* is often spelt *-re*, as *nerrē*, *ferre*. Some of these forms are even found in Shakespeare.

2. *Bet* (better), *lenger* (longer), etc., have now become obsolete.

3. The superlative ending is *-estē* or *-est*, as *fairestē*.

4. *Nest* (next), *hext* (highest), are contractions.

*Number*.—1. Monosyllabic adjectives (and occasionally others) form the plural in *-ē*, as *faireē*.

2. Where a plural in *-ēs* occurs, it is a remain of a Romance form, as *delitables*.

### *Pronouns.*

*Personal and Demonstrative* pronouns are thus declined:

#### *Singular.*

<i>Nom.</i>	I, Ik, Ich,	thou,	<i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i>	<i>n.</i>
<i>Poss.</i>	min, mi(y),	thin, thi(y).	he,	she,	(h)it.
<i>Dat. and Obj.</i>	me,	the(e),	his,	hir(e),	his.

#### *Plural.*

<i>Nom.</i>	we,	ye,	thei(y).
<i>Poss.</i>	our(e),	your(e),	her(e), hir.
<i>Dat. and Obj.</i>	us,	you(w)	hem.

1. In the predicative forms of these pronouns, *oures*, *youres*, *heres*, are found side by side with *oure*, *youre*, *here*. Morris says these are northern forms.

2. Datives after certain adjectives, adverbs, impersonal verbs, and verbs of motion, should be noticed, as *wo thee*, *me thoughte*, *goth him*.

3. Sometimes *tha* (the), plural of *tho* (the), is found in Chaucer.

4. *That oon, that other* (in Shakespeare *the tone, the tother*) contain the old neuter article *that*, not used elsewhere by Chaucer.

5. The plural of *this* is *thise, thes(e)*.

6. We also find *tho* (sometimes for *the*, sometimes for *those*), *thilke* (the like), *that ilke* (that same), used as demonstratives.

### *Interrogatives and Relatives.*

1. *Which* occurs differently from the present usage:

a. As we use *what*:

‘Whiche they weren, and of what degree.

b. Joined with *that* in a relativa sense, as :

‘The which that he oweth.’

2. *What* is often for *why*:

‘What schulde he studie and make himselfen wood.’

This usage lasted till Shakespeare’s time, and has misled the commentators greatly.

3. *That* often takes a superfluous personal or demonstrative pronoun after it, as :

‘I saugh to-day a corps yborn to chirche,  
That now on Monday last I saw him whirche.’

*That him* is equivalent to *whom*.

4. *Who so, who, me, men*, are equivalent to *one, anyone*, thus: *as who saith* (as one says)—GOWER; *stop me his dice* (let any one stop his dice)—LODGE; *as who should say*—North’s *Plutarch*. This usage lasted till the seventeenth century, as the examples show.

*Verbs.*

## CONJUGATION OF WEAK VERBS.

*Indicative Mood, Present Tense.*

I lovè.  
 Thou loves(t).  
 He loveth.  
 We, ye, they, love(n).

*Past Tense.*

I lovedè.  
 Thou lovedest.  
 He lovedè.  
 We, ye, they lovede(n).

*Subjunctive Mood, Present and Past.*

If I, thou, he, lovè—lovedè.  
 If we, ye, they, love(n)—loveden.

*Participles.*

Lovynge(e) or loving(e); yloved.

*Imperative Mood.*

Love thou.  
 love(th) ye.

*Infinitive Mood.*


To love(n).

- Where the omission of a short vowel in an inflexion brings two consonants of the same class together (for instance, two dentals), contraction often takes place, thus: *fint* (*findeth*), *rist* (*riseth*), *wende* (*wended*), *sterte* (*started*); so in Shakespeare we find *exhaust* (*exhausted*), *wed* (*wedded*), etc.

- A plural in (e)th in some MSS. is found, as, *Ther schyneth two figures*.

## STRONG VERBS.

- Some have double forms in past tense, as, *I wēp* (*strong*), *I wept* (*weak*, or rather cumulative, *weak upon strong*).



2. In the past indicative singular *è* is not added, thus :

I smoot.  
Thou smootest, smoot(è).  
He smoot.  
We, ye, they, smite(n).

3. In other points the strong and weak verbs coincide.

4. The gerundive (dative) infinitive sometimes occurs, as, *to doone*.

5. The passive participle ends in *-e(n)*, as, *sterve(n)*, and frequently takes the prefix *i*, as, *ifalle(n)*.

6. For negative and anomalous verbs see Dr Morris's *Historical Accidence*.

### *Adverbs.*

These are formed in *-en*, *-è*, *-es*, as, *above(n)*, *ofte*, *needes*.

Much further detail will be found in Professor Child's *Essay on Chaucer*.

### METRE.

Chaucer's favourite metres were the following :

1. *Octosyllabic Couplets*.—Two lines of formula, 4  $\text{—}$  (iambic dimeter acatalectic). Rhyme formula, *aa*. The first syllable is sometimes dropped in this metre. This must be regarded not as altering the character of the verse in this author, but as an occasional licence. Examples : *Romaunt of the Rose*, *Chaucer's Dream*, *Death of the Duchess*, *House of Fame*.

2. *Rhyme-Royal, or Chaucerian Stanza*.—The latter is the preferable name. Seven-line stanza with rhyme formula, *ababbcc*. Each line of stanza, 5  $\text{—}$  (iambic trimeter brachycatalectic). Examples : *Second Nun's Tale*, *Priores' Tale*, *Man of Law's Tale*, *Clerk's Tale*, *Orison to the Virgin*, *Troylus and Cryseyde*, *Assembly of Fowls*, *L'Envoy to Skogan*, *Complaint to Pity*, etc.

3. *Heroic Couplets*.—Rhyme formula, *aa*. Line formula, 5  $\text{—}$ . Omission of the first syllable not allowed in this metre, nor lines of form 6  $\text{—}$ . Every instance of lines apparently assuming such forms can be easily explained. Examples : *Legend of Good Women*, and nearly all the *Canterbury Tales*.

4. *Short Spenserians*.—I propose this name for the eight-line stanza, with rhyme formula, *ababbcbc*. Each line of

formula,  $5 \sim -$ . It is Spenser's stanza, minus the final Alexandrine. Examples: *A.B.C., L'Envoy à Bukton, Monk's Tale*.

5. *Long Chaucerians*.—I propose this name for nine-line stanzas, of rhyme formula,  $aabbbaabbcc$ , each line being of formula  $5 \sim -$ . It differs from (short) Chaucerian by the insertion of the second and fifth lines. Examples: *The Complaint of Mars, Complaint of Annelyda*.

6. *Ballade*.—This consists of three stanzas, which repeat the same rhymes, with or without a fourth, called *l'envoy*. Sometimes *l'envoy* is like the other three, sometimes not. In Chaucer the metre is usually (short) Chaucerian, and the last line of each stanza ends with the same word. All these rules are observed in *Lack of Stedfastness, Complaint to his Purse, Flee from the Press*. In the *Ballad of Gentleness* the *l'envoy* is apparently lost.

In one instance the rules are not strictly observed. In the *l'envoy* to the *Clerk's Tale* there are six stanzas all in same rhymes, but not with same end-word to each stanza. Mr Furnival has introduced the word 'tern' for three such stanzas, but ballad is a perfectly correct name for them; tern is, however, a convenient name to show the omission of *l'envoy*. This *l'envoy* would be a double-tern or sextern.

Mr Furnival, however, uses the term tern in several places where no such structure exists, and where the number of stanzas is indefinite. This is quite erroneous.

7. Chaucer also uses three terns and *l'envoy* of short Spenserians. Examples: *Complaint of Venus*, and *Ballade de Visage sans Peinture (Fortune)*.

8. In *Sir Thopas* he uses stanza of six lines, rhyme formula,  $aacbbc$ ; *a* and *b* lines of formula  $4 \sim -$ , and *c* of  $3 \sim -$ . This is a common metre in romances; but Chaucer introduces the singular addition of a line of  $1 \sim -$  in any part of stanza rhyming to *c*, and occasionally carrying other irregularities with it.

9. The structure of *Annelyda's Complaint* deserves special attention. It consists of sixteen stanzas arranged thus: *A(4B,2C,D)(4B,2C,D),A*. The *D* stanzas have additional middle rhymes in each line, thus:

‘ That love you most | God thou it wost | alway.’

The rhyme formula for the *C* stanzas is, *aaabaaab,bbbabbba*; and the line formula for lines 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, is  $4 \sim -$ , for 4, 8, is  $5 \sim -$ .

In the *Romaunt of the Rose* and *Chaucer's Dream* rhymes of words in -y and words in -ye are admitted, as they were by Chaucer's predecessors and successors. In all later poems than the above, written by Chaucer, such rhymes are not admitted. Hence these poems are rejected by Bradshaw and others. The probability is that Chaucer, between 1359 and 1369, was influenced by Gower, his contemporary, the only other poet who observes this somewhat arbitrary rule, to adopt the exclusion of -y -ye rhymes. He certainly never used them after 1369.

## CHAPTER IV.

### CHAUCER'S WORKS AND THEIR CHRONOLOGY.

I NOW give a table for reference of Chaucer's works, in which are tabulated in columns : (1) Their titles, both those given in the editions and those since introduced by Mr Ellis and Mr Furnival for convenience of reference ; (2) The number of lines in the prologues to the tales ; (3) The authors used by Chaucer in writing each work, as far as we know them ; (4) The number of lines in each poem ; (5) The metre of each poem ; (6) and (7) Their dates as assigned by myself and Mr Furnival respectively.

In the metre column O stands for octosyllabic couplets ; C for Chaucer stanza, or ballad royal ; LC for long Chaucerian stanza ; H for heroic couplets ; S for short Spenserian stanza ; R for romance ; B for ballad ; E for *envoy* ; T for triad (tern) of stanzas. All of which terms are explained under the head of 'Metre.'

After deliberate and careful examination, I have come to the following conclusions : that the *Complaint of the Black Knight* is Lydgate's ; that the *Lamentation of Mary Magdalen* and the *Praise of Women*, are probably not Chaucer's, and certainly worthless, whosesoever they are ; that the *Court of Love* is probably Skogan's ; but that, beyond this, I cannot join in the rejection of any works attributed to Chaucer, merely on the ground that -y -ye rhymes are found in them. The *Flower and the Leaf*, for instance, is certainly not his ; but I reject it as well as the other poems enumerated above, on grounds entirely distinct from metrical arguments : which latter are, as I have pointed out elsewhere, of no use as separating class tests, though invaluable as characteristic tests, after the separation has been made. This test of -y -ye rhyme, for instance, turns out on deeper investigation to be absolute in distinguishing the first period of Chaucer's life (up to 1360) from the later ones, but is quite valueless as a test of authorship during that first period.

## TITLE OF WORK (with Synonyms).

Reference No.
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

- Romaunt of the Rose, . . . . .  
 Chaucer's Dream (Is the *Envoy* Chaucer's?), . . . . .  
 Book of the Duchess (Death of Blanche), . . . . .  
 House of Fame, . . . . .  
 Second Nun's Tale (Cecilie), . . . . .  
 Prioress' Tale (Little Clergeoun and Jews), . . . . .  
 Orison to Holy Virgin (Incipit Oratio Galfridi Chaucer), 'Mother of God,' . . . . .  
 Man of Law's Tale (Constance), . . . . .  
 Clerk's Tale (Grisildis), . . . . .  
 L'Envoy, . . . . .  
 Boece (Translation of Boethius), . . . . .  
 Assembly of Fowls (Parliament of Birds), . . . . .  
 Of Mars and Venus (with Complaint of Mars), . . . . .  
 Of Queen Annelyda and False Arcite (with Complaint of Annelyda), . . . . .  
 Troylus and Cryseyde, . . . . .  
 Chaucer's Words unto his own Scrivener, . . . . .  
 Complaint of the Death of Pity, . . . . .  
 L'Envoy de Chaucer a Skogan, . . . . .  
 Knight's Tale (first sketch), . . . . .  
 Doctor of Physic's Tale (Virginius), . . . . .  
 Legend of Good Women } Cleopatra, . . . . .  
 (Saints' Legend of Cupid) } Thisbe, . . . . .  
     "           "           Dido, . . . . .  
     "           "           Hypsipyle and Medea, . . . . .  
     "           "           Lucretia, . . . . .  
     "           "           Ariadne, . . . . .  
     "           "           Philomene, . . . . .  
     "           "           Phyllis, . . . . .  
     "           "           Hypermnestra, . . . . .  
 Knight's Tale (Palamon and Arcite), . . . . .  
 General Prologue to Canterbury Tales, . . . . .  
 Squire's Tale (Cambynskan), . . . . .  
 Franklin's Tale (Arviragus and Dorigen), . . . . .  
 Manciple's Tale (Phoebus and White Crow), . . . . .  
 Nun's Priest's Tale (Chanticleer), . . . . .  
 Wife of Bath's Tale (Knight and Foul Wife), . . . . .  
 Merchant's Tale (January and May), . . . . .  
 Shipman's Tale (Dan Johan and the Merchant), . . . . .  
 Miller's Tale (Nicholas, Absolon, and the Carpenter's Wife), . . . . .  
 Reeve's Tale (Miller of Trumpington), . . . . .  
 Cook's Tale (Prentice), . . . . .  
 Friar's Tale (Sumner and Devil), . . . . .  
 Sumner's Tale (Friar and Husbandman), . . . . .  
 Pardoner's Tale (Three Rioters), . . . . .  
 Canon's Yeoman's Tale (False Canon and Priest), . . . . .  
 Treatise on the Astrolabie, . . . . .  
 Sir Thopas, . . . . .  
 Melibceus, . . . . .  
 L'Envoy de Chaucer a Bukton, . . . . .  
 Monk's Tale (Harm of them that stood in High Degree), . . . . .  
 A.B.C. (Prière de Nostre Dame), . . . . .  
 Parson's Tale, . . . . .  
 Ballad (Gentleness), . . . . .  
 Complaint of Venus (Ballad), . . . . .  
 Ballade de Visage sans Peinture (Fortune), . . . . .  
 Ballade sent to King Richard (Lack of Stedfastness), . . . . .  
 Complaint of Chaucer to his Purse (Ballad), . . . . .  
 Good Counsel of Chaucer (Ballad), 'Flee from the Press,' . . . . .

Reference No.	Lines in Prologues.	Authors translated, quoted, or imitated.	No. of Lines.	Metre.	Supposed date (Fleay).	Supposed date (Furnival).
1	....	G. de Lorris, J. de Meun.	7699	O	1353.	....
2	....	.....	2206	O	1359.	....
3	....	Machault	1322+11	O (lay)	1369.	1369.
4	....	Dante	2170	O	1374-5	1384.
5.	....	Dante, Jac. a Voragine	553	C	1374	1373.
6	18 (H)	.....	238	C	1375-7.	1373-84.
7	....	.....	140	C	1375-7	1386-
8	98 (H)	Petrarch (cf. Boccaccio)	1064	C	1375-7	1373-84
9	56 (H)	.....	1120	C	1375-7	1373-84
10	....	.....	36	B (or 2 T)	....	....
11	....	Dante, Boccaccio	Prose	....	1376-7	1376-
12	....	.....	686+8	C(roundel)	1378	1374-84.
13	....	.....	154+144	C, LC	1378	1374-84.
14	....	Boccaccio, Statius	217+144	C, LC, &c.	1378	1374-84
15	....	Boccaccio, Dante	8253	C	1378-82	1382.
16	....	.....	7	C	1382	1382-4
17	....	.....	119	C	1382	1366-8
18	....	.....	49	C	1382.	1393.
19	....	Boccaccio, Dante	....	....	1383.	1383.
20	6	Livy	286	H	1383.	1374-86
21	558+21	Ovid	126	H(B (or T) in prolog.)	1383-6	1386.
22	....	.....	218	....	....	....
23	....	.....	442	....	....	....
24	....	.....	312	....	....	....
25	....	.....	206	....	....	....
26	....	.....	342	....	....	....
27	....	.....	167	....	....	....
28	....	.....	168	....	....	....
29	....	.....	162	....	....	....
30	....	.....	2250	H	1387	1387
31	....	.....	860	H	1388	1388
32	30	.....	672	H	1388-93	1374-86
33	56	Ovid	888	H	"	"
34	104	.....	258	H	"	"
35	54	.....	626	H	"	1386-90
36	866	.....	408	H	"	"
37	32	.....	102	H	"	"
38	28	.....	426	H	"	"
39	76	.....	666	H	"	"
40	66	.....	604	H	"	"
41	40	.....	58	H	"	"
42	36	.....	364	H	"	"
43	44	.....	586	H	"	"
44	176	.....	506	H	"	"
45	458	.....	470	H	"	1390-93
46	....	.....	....	Prose	1391	1391
47	21 (C)	.....	204	R	1393-4	1374-86
48	....	.....	....	Prose	"	"
49	....	.....	32	S	"	1393
50	102	{ Boccaccio, ? Petrarch, } Bible, Boethius, Lucan.	776	S	"	"
51	....	De Guilleville	184	S	"	1360-66
52	....	.....	....	Prose	1394	Late.
53	....	.....	21	B (or T)	1394	1393.
54	....	Graunson	80	3 T+E	1395-7	1392.
55	....	Boethius	80	3 T+E	"	"
56	....	.....	28	B+E	1397	1397
57	....	.....	28	B+E	1399	1399
58	....	.....	28	B+E	"	1386-7

I can confirm this conclusion from my own experience as a rhymer. I have written (though fortunately for myself, not published) as much as Chaucer. Now, in my first period up to leaving the university, I used to rhyme *-in* and *-ing* in imitation of my then favourite models, especially of Mrs Browning. After this time this assonance became disagreeable to me, and I deliberately made a holocaust of some 10,000 lines of verse, which I then was foolish enough to consider as otherwise valuable. I have never, I believe, rhymed *-in* and *-ing* since. Now, comparing small things with great, this is just what I think Chaucer did.

Chaucer wrote youthful poems. Among them he began the translation of the *Romance of the Rose*, with *-y -ye* rhymes. He suddenly took a dislike to these imperfect assonances, stopped short in his translation, destroyed a lot of his ballads, roundels, and such small fry, and adopted a more perfect system, leaving us of his young work only the *Chaucer's Dream* and the unfinished translation, with the possible addition of a ballad. Of course if other arguments than the metrical can be convincingly brought against these three poems, I am willing to give them up. I only decline to do so on this sole argument.

During this first *-y -ye* period, and until 1370, in which he was under French influence, exclusively of Italian, he wrote his important poems only in four-measure couplets. He next introduced his seven-lined stanza, known as rhyme-royal, or Chaucer's stanza ; but no other metre than these two did he (in my opinion) use, until he wrote the *Legend of Good Women*, being all through his second period (1374-1382) under Italian influence. A great change then occurred ; he utterly abandoned his four-measure couplets for five-measure, usually called 'heroics,' and exchanged his rhyme-royal for an eight-line stanza, which is what Spenser's stanza would be without the last line. I have called this metre 'short Spenserian.' He retains, however, rhyme-royal for ballads (or terns, if we adopt Mr Furnival's nomenclature), where three or more stanzas end with the same rhymes. Thus far all critics will agree with me as far as the great poems are concerned ; they may differ from me as to some short and unimportant ones. There are also, I should notice, two poems written partly in an exceptional metre, which I have called 'long Chaucerian'—namely, the *Complaint of Mars* and the *Complaint of Annelyda*.

Having thus separated our poems into groups, the next point is to find, if possible, some dates certainly fixed, round

which to group the rest. We find such in *Chaucer's Dream*, which, if written by him, must be placed in 1359, at the marriage of John of Gaunt; in the *Death of the Duchess Blanche*, which must be put in 1369; in the *Assembly of Birds*, which, I think, attaches to the putting off the marriage of Richard II with Mary, the daughter of the French king, in 1378; in the general prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, and the revised *Knight's Tale*, which occupy 1387-8; in the *L'Envoy to Skogan*, which I shall presently try to fix in 1382; and in some small poems written in the last few years of his life. We also know the *House of Fame* must be dated between 1374 and 1384, and that the *Nun's Tale* (*St Cecilie*) is settled in 1373-4. The rest we must make out as we best may. My arrangement is given in the table, p. 30. The whole of the last batch, 1397-9, are ballads;\* such of the dates in the table as have not been noticed as certain, must be looked on at present merely as approximations. We shall, however, see, I hope, that they cannot be far wrong.

On the earliest poems I have little to say here. If the *Dream of the Duchess* be Chaucer's, as I feel sure the *Romance of the Rose* is, there is a progressive change in metre visible in these early poems, as we might expect; not only is there the abandonment of the -y -ye rhymes, but there is a gradual introduction from the very first of a marked peculiarity of Chaucer's—the ending the first line of a couplet with a full stop. This is found in the *Romance*, and increases till it attains its maximum in the *House of Fame*.

This latter poem may have been finished later, being written in Chaucer's recognised fragmentary fashion; but I feel sure it was begun, if not completed, in 1374. His complaints of the drudgery of office work are more suited to an early than a late experience of it: in 1384 (Professor Ten Brink's date), the use of ten years must have become a second nature; and surely the lines,

\* In ballads it is necessary that in three consecutive verses at least, the rhymes should be formed on the same sounds. Thus: -all, -end, -ance, are the three rhyme-sounds in the *Godly Ballad of Chaucer*. It is a mistake to speak of the *Mother of God*, or *L'Envoy to Skogan*, as in any sense being composed in 'terns.' It would be as fitting to say that the *Troylus and Cryseyde* was in terns, if the number of its stanzas happened to be divisible by three. The word 'tern' is Mr Furnival's nomenclature for what Chaucer calls 'ballades.'

‘To study and read alway,  
I purpose to do day by day’—*House of Fame*,

are earlier than :

‘And thus to read I will not spare’—*Assembly of Fowls*,

where the habit seems to have been already acquired.

I think, also, the gradual extension of Italian influence is worth notice in these early poems, as an aid in determining the chronology. In the *House of Fame* and the *St Cecilia*, we can trace the influence of Dante (see Professor Ten Brink’s *Studies*); but in the *Troylus and Cryseyde*, in addition to Dante, we find Boccaccio’s *Filostrato* largely drawn on; and in the *Assembly of Fowls*, and the *Annelyda and Arcite*, the use of the *Teseide* of the same author connects this group with the *Palamon and Arcite*, the earliest tale of the second period. Other works of his are used in the *Legend of Good Women*, and the *Monk’s Tale*.

That the poems placed in the latter half of 1374, and which very likely may include part of 1375, are closely allied, no one who reads them together can doubt. The connection between the poems of the 1378 group has been well shown by Mr Furnival, though his theory of Chaucer’s eight years’ heartache has led him to assign a different date to them. The 1382 group I shall treat at length presently.

It is very noticeable that a great change in manner of work, specially marked by the introduction of humour as a predominant characteristic of the subject-matter, is immediately subsequent to the death of Chaucer’s wife. We should be much better able to form clear ideas of the state of his mind at this period if we could get at some certainty as to his age. Professor Henry Morley, one of the soundest of present Chaucer critics, still adheres to the old date of 1328 for his birth-year. Nor do I feel it practicable to give it up, though I should for many reasons be glad to do so; it has little evidence of a direct nature in its favour; but the later date of 1340-5 has none whatever that will bear analysis. The advocates of 1340 seem to have proceeded in this way: In spite of its mere generality of form, and its association with many other date-statements, whose falsity has been fully shown by Sir Harris Nicolas, the statement of Chaucer’s being forty years and upwards in 1386 is interpreted literally by way of foundation; then it is assumed that Chaucer’s office in 1357-9 must have been a juvenile one; this is surmounted by the theory that Chaucer did not marry Philippa

Roet, of whose existence we are sure, but some hypothetical cousin or namesake; and on the summit of this three-storied edifice is erected an imaginary statue of Chaucer as Cupid's slave in chains, suffering from an 'ache' of eight years' duration. It is an artistic and beautiful edifice, but, I fear, only a castle in the air.

In the second period I am happy to say that for several of the smaller poems I have had little to do but adopt Mr Furnival's conclusions, which appear to me sound and well worked out. The *L'Envoy à Bukton*, however, is fixed by the place I assign to the *Wife of Bath's Tale*; and the *A.B.C.*, in metre, in thinness and poverty of manner, is so like this *L'Envoy*, and still more like the *Monk's Tale*, that I have no hesitation in dating it 1393-4. I ought, also, to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr Furnival for the names he has given to some of the small poems, which I have adopted.


I do not, however, agree with the dates which he assigns to the *Complaint of Venus* and *Fortune*. The expression,

'Elde that in my spirit dulleth,'

seems to me to fix the former of these in the last years of Chaucer's life, and to be quite inconsistent with the time he assigns for its composition in 1392-3. Chaucer would, on his hypothesis, be then only fifty-two years old. And as the *Parson's Tale* mentions *J'ai tout perdu*, as a new French song, and a line of this is quoted in the *Fortune*, I cannot separate these two productions by an interval of more than a few months. The *Parson's Tale* is admittedly very late. The *Fortune* cannot be several years earlier. On the other hand, the pointing out 1378 as one of the years suitable for the *Complaint of Mars*, on the supposition that Phoebus in this poem represents a friend of John of Gaunt, and not that nobleman himself, who was in this year absent on the Continent, is entirely due to Mr Furnival.

I now proceed to give a few remarks on each poem separately.

The *Romance of the Rose*, if Chaucer's, was probably written in 1353. That it was not his appears to be a conjecture founded only on its imperfect rhyming, and cannot for a moment be allowed to outweigh his own definite statement. The notion that two translations of this poem were contemporaneously made is one of those critical shifts that have in Germany become obsolete. Why not in England too? There is a passage (vii, 141, Bell) not in the original which is probably autobiographical:



' For I am fallen into hell  
 From paradise and wealth; the more  
 My torment grieveth; more and more  
 Annoyeth now the bitterness,  
 That I toforn have felt sweetness.'

But we know nothing of Chaucer's life so early as this, and therefore cannot interpret it. One strong evidence of the authorship is that the parts used by Chaucer in other poems, are all from the omitted portions of the translation—viz., the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, and the *Tales of Virginia*, *Nero*, *Cræsus*, and *Hecuba*. Another is the manner in which Chaucer has translated:

' Vous en irez où puis d'enfer ;'

which agrees with the punishment assigned to the friars by the *Pardonner*. It is not likely that the same coarseness would have been hit on by two minds independently; and it does not read like a case of copying. But if this poem is his, I can see no reason why the beautiful *Chaucer's Dream* should not be his too. The argument from the rhyming needs strong confirmation on other grounds to induce its rejection. If it be Chaucer's, it must have been written in 1359, on the marriage of John of Gaunt, but not for him. It was written for Philippa, Chaucer's future wife, whom he probably married in 1360. He says in it that his lady would no pity use; but this is only the usual conventional court-of-love language. The *envoy* is possibly not Chaucer's; the laws of ballad rhyming are not properly observed in it; and it has no connection with this poem rather than any other. It may, however, be Chaucer's first attempt of this kind, afterwards to be succeeded by more exact work in ballads, as in -y -ye rhymes.

The *Death of the Duchess* was written in 1369 for John of Gaunt. In it occurs the passage:

' A sickness  
 That I have suffered this eight year,  
 And yet my boot is ne'er the near.  
 For is phisicien but one  
 That may me hele; but that is done;  
 Passe we over until eft;  
 That will not be, mote needs be left.'

This is the record of Chaucer's eight years' hopeless love, according to Mr Furnival. It seems to me to have quite a different meaning. I must first, however, amend the punctua-

tion. As the passage stands it is nonsense. What is done? The healing or the sickness? Either way the words are inconsistent with what precedes. Read:

‘For is physician but one  
That may me heal. But that is done  
Pass we over until eft!’

The sickness is married life, which was, as we shall see in the *Canterbury Tales*, anything but satisfactory to Chaucer; he had now been married eight years and a bit. The physician is death; and the construction of the last lines is: But let us pass over till another time the consideration of *what* is done and cannot be undone; we cannot interfere with the laws of fate; *what* we cannot have, we must leave. *That*=‘*what*’ in both cases.

The *Book of Fame* was certainly begun, if not finished, in 1374. In metre, in conduct, in style, it is like the *Duchess*. The beginnings of these two poems especially are similar; so are the descriptions of the god of sleep’s abode (*Duchess*, vi, 141 (Bell); *Fame*, vi, 196). The allusions to ‘good women,’ to Dido, Phyllis, Ariadne, Medea, etc., do not connect it any more with the *Legend of Good Women* than with the preceding poem, where Medea, Phyllis, and Dido are all enumerated (p. 159). The *Heroïdes* or *Cupid’s Martyrs* seem to have taken early and strong hold on Chaucer.

We have in it also a clear allusion to his unhappy married life:

‘Me mette he thus to me said,  
Right in the same voice and steven,  
*That useth one I coulde neveren:*  
And with that voice, sooth for to sayn,  
My minde came to me again.  
For hit was goodly said to me :  
So was it *never wont to be.*’

This must be his wife’s voice. What other was ‘wont’ to be used to him, that would require so covert an allusion? We find, directly after, that Chaucer has made books (namely, the *Rose* and the *Dream*), songs, ditties in rhyme or cadence (? ballads), in reverence of Love and his servants:

‘And painest thee to praise his art,  
*Although thou haddest never part.*’

He must have been disappointed. And then we are told ‘that he has no tidings of Love’s people, if they be glad;

nor of nought else that God made; not even of his neighbours, that dwell almost at his doors.' He could have seen very little of his wife surely. 'When he has made his reckonings, instead of rest and news, he goes home and sits at another book till he is dazed.' He takes refuge in his books from the want of sympathy, to say the least, shown him by his wife. And I think this must have been written early in his custom-house life. A man grumbles most when the shoe begins to pinch him; after ten years (according to Professor Ten Brink's date, 1384) he would have been sufficiently broken in to say nothing about what could not be amended.

Again, the description of him as—

‘Disesperat of alle bliss,  
Sith that fortune hath made amiss,  
The frot of all thine hertes rest  
Languish and eke in point to brest,’

confirming my interpretation of his domestic life as an unhappy mistake, leads us to the final statement that—

‘To study and read alway  
I purpose to do day by day;’

which suits my date, 1374, well, as the commencement of a period of literary activity.

In the *Assembly of Fowls* (date 1378, as it refers to the embassy concerning the marriage of Richard II to the French king's daughter) we have the first of the Valentine's Day poems rightly grouped together by Mr Furnival. In it Chaucer continues his complaint that 'he knows not Love, indeed; not how he quits folk their hire.' He still takes refuge in reading:

‘On booke read I oft as I you told.’

But when it gets too dark to read, he goes to bed fulfilled of heaviness:

‘For both I hadde thing which that I nold,  
And eke I ne had that thing which I wold.’

He dreams; Affrican tells him in his dream:

‘Thou of love hast lost thy taste, I guess,  
As sick man hath of sweet and bitterness.’

He is so dull he may not do, but yet he may see, but no more; though this is more than he attains to in the

*House of Fame*, where he gets no news of lovers after all Jove's promises; he wakes, and takes then to read other books, and will not spare to do so because he hopes to 'fare the bet' some day.

In the *Mars*, closely connected with this, being another Valentine's Day poem, and of the same date, 1378\* (one of the two possible dates given by Mr Furnival), we have an exact parallel in the discovery of the lovers by Phœbus to the passage in *Troylus* (v, 166). This has been sufficiently dwelt on by others; I merely notice it here as a confirmation of the date.

In the *Annellyda and Arcite*, which brings this series to an end with an unfinished poem, just as in similar instances in the *Canterbury Tales*, we have certainly a poem of the same date. It is connected with the *Mars* by its long-Chaucerian metre; with the *Knight's Tale* by its subject-matter, being taken from Boccaccio's *Teseide*; with the *Legend*, as being the first attempt to write of one of Cupid's martyrs; with *Troylus and Cryseyde*, as the commencement of a picture meant as a pendant, showing the truth of women and falsity of men in contrast to the true Troilus and false Cressida. It must lie in the midst of these at the date I have given it.

In the *Troylus* (which occupied from 1378 to 1382) we have an almost verbatim repetition of the passage quoted above from the *Fame*:

‘I, that the God of Love’s servants serve,  
Ne dare to love for mine unlikeness.’

He begs lovers also to pray—

‘For them that been in the case of Troylus.  
For them that ben despaired  
In love; that never wil recovered be;  
And eke for them that falsely ben appaired  
Through wicked tongues, *be it he or she.*’

A little further on we find (v, 64) that Chaucer writes his tales with a meaning:

‘How so it be that some men them delyght  
With subtle art or talis to endite,  
Yet, for all that, in their intention  
Their tale is all for some conclusion.’

\* 1378 is a year pointed out by Mr Furnival as one suitable for the *Complaint of Mars*, supposing Phœbus to be a friend, and not John of Gaunt himself, who was absent during this year on the Continent.

I think we may fairly infer that the *Troylus* is after the *Fame*, seeing that the corresponding passages come at the end of the *Fame* and the beginning of the *Troylus*, and that all this Troilus story has a hidden meaning. This is confirmed by the fact that, in the *Legend*, Alceste defends him for writing the *Troylus* on the grounds ‘that he did it not of malice, and may have been *bidden to do it*;’ and by the further fact that Chaucer studiously hides the authorship of his original; saying that he takes his matter from *Lollius*. Lydgate, who seems to have been in the secret, says the original was a book called *Trophe*. As to what *Trophe* means, see above, p. 17; *Lollius* also seems to refer in some obscure way to the *Lolliana clades*; certainly not to Lollius the historian. But it is clear that Chaucer puts forth a pretended original which did not exist, in order to pass off some parts of the poem really written by himself as being merely translation. The only conceivable reason for this is, that they contained in them some record of facts, real, not imaginary; and we can only guess these facts to be connected with Cecilia de Champagne and her *raptus*. I do not take *Lollius* to be a name for Boccaccio, but the name of some book written about Lollius. This manner of quoting from *Aeneidos* and *Metamorphoseos*, as if they were writers, instead of from Virgil and Ovid, is too common in Chaucer to need illustration. It is also remarkable that in the *Troylus*, Cressida forgives Pandarus for his share in her *raptus*, while nothing is said of forgiving Troilus, the principal in the matter. If this, as I guess, shadows forth the story of Cecilia de Champagne, it would exactly agree with Mr Furnival’s opinion that Chaucer could only have been an accessory in that matter, inasmuch as a compounding of felony on behalf of the principal could not have been effected by a deed publicly enrolled. It is worth mentioning also that *Lollius* is referred to in a marginal note in a manuscript of another part of Chaucer’s works. This does not look as if it, whether writing or writer, was so unknown in the fifteenth century as we have been in the habit of supposing. But enough on this matter, as, after all, I have only conjecture to offer on it.

The poem seems to have been meant for recitation, not reading from a MS. ‘Every wight’ is called on to listen; ‘all this company’ is appealed to; and still more strongly:

‘I have not heard it done or this  
In story none, *ne no man here*, I wene’—V, 132.

This, to me, confirms its having been written to order. Other reasons for the date which I assign may be found in the following passages :

‘ Hast thou some remorse of conscience ?  
And art now fallen in some devotion,  
And wailest for thy sin and thine offence,  
And hast for ferde caught attrition ’—V, 38.

This refers to the *Mother of God*.

‘ Hit sate me well bete aye in a cave  
To bide and rede of holy saintes lives ’—V, 60.

This refers to the *Saint Cecilie*.

Chaucer is ‘the clerk of them that serve Venus’ (v, 117), but ‘cannot say one of the least of their delights or joys’ (v, 161). He speaks under correction of those that ‘have feeling in Love’s art.’ Hence again I infer that whatever concern Chaucer had in the *raptus* of Cecilia, was only as an agent, not as a principal; and this is confirmed by the statement of the law on this matter, given by Mr Furnival, and by the similar statement of the law in King Arthur’s days, at the beginning of the *Wife of Bath’s Tale*. At any rate, Chaucer’s whole soul is in the line :

‘ Why had I such one with my soule bought ? ’

Mrs Chaucer seems to have been cold, unsympathising, and shrewish, with probably the same peculiarities that are ascribed to Zenobia in the *Monk’s Tale*. Chaucer takes refuge in his writing. He has already planned the *Good Women*, will write of ‘Penelope’s truth and good Alceste,’ but prays that—

‘ God, my maker, yet ere that I die,  
So send me might to make some comedy.’

We know how this prayer was answered.

The 1382 group I must treat at greater length, under the head of ‘Chaucer and Skogan.’ It will, however, be convenient to mention the *Legend* in this place. In this poem we find Chaucer still delighting in reading, except in May, when the fowls sing. And here we have Chaucer’s declaration of his love for the daisy, his identification of this flower with Alceste, his sovereign lady, the good wife *par excellence*; and his allusion to the servants of the leaf and the flower. The other poems on this subject are not Chaucer’s, and subse-

quent in date, as I shall presently try to show. He repents of his heresy against Cupid, but still knows nothing of love :

‘ As doon these lovers, as I have heard said.’

The prologue dates 1382-3; the tales, 1383-6. Their approximation to the *Canterbury Tales* is shown in similar phrases :

‘ Pity renneth soon in gentle heart’

(which occurs also in the *Knight’s Tale*);

‘ In Thessaly as Ovid telleth us’

(compare the beginnings of several of the *Canterbury Tales*); and in other instances quoted elsewhere. His comedy also begins to develop :

‘ Now ere I find a man thus true and stable,  
And would for love his death so freely take,  
*I pray God let our heades never ake.*’

And of Dido and Æneas in the cave :

‘ I n’ot if with them there went any mo ;  
The author mak’th of hit no mencioum.’

And in his advice to women :

‘ Beware, ye women, of your subtle foe,  
*And as in love, trusteth no man but me.*’

The poem was meant for recitation. He speaks thus :

‘ But in this house if any false lover be.’

Its date is fixed by the fact that there are two versions of the prologue, one without the notice of the queen at Eltham, which was therefore probably before 1382, the date of Richard II’s marriage; the other certainly after that same date, as it contains the allusion referred to. I date the poem, therefore, 1382-3, and join it with the cycle of poems we have now to speak of.

## CHAPTER V.

### CHAUCER AND SKOGAN.

ONE of Chaucer's minor poems is entitled *L'Envoy de Chaucer à Skogan*. It consists of seven stanzas of rhyme-royal, written in singularly accurate metre. The contents are to the following purport: The eternal statutes in heaven are broken; for the seven planet-gods are weeping. Whence may this thing proceed? No drop of tears was formerly permitted by the eternal word (that is, *weird*, destiny) to escape from the fifth sphere, that of Venus; now she will drown us with her tears: it is a deluge of pestilence. Skogan, this is for thy offence. Thou saidst thou hadst given up thy lady at Michaelmas, because she saw not thy distress. Cupid will therefore no longer be lord of thee. I fear he will involve in his anger all that be, like us, hoary and round of shape. You may scoff at 'old Grisel,' but I excuse myself; though in poor metre, for my muse is rusty. I mean not to put her forth as when I was young. Do you at court, at Windsor, remember your friend's solitude at Greenwich?

The first thing to find out, is the date of the heavy rains alluded to: not rains *and* pestilence, but rains *of* pestilence—rains likely to produce pestilence. Chaucer's poems being written before the rain has ceased, he cannot tell whether pestilence will follow certainly, although, as it was the usual consequence, he might well call the rain a deluge of pestilence, in anticipation of the probable result. Now on searching for years of heavy rain we find four, any one of which may be the one alluded to: 1348, 1366, 1382, 1393. The last of them is the one advocated by the critics who reject the ordinarily received date of Chaucer's birth in 1328, as, if he were born after 1340 it suits the words 'hoar and round' better than earlier dates. The dates of 1348 and 1366, which have been adopted by other critics, not only do not suit these words, even if the early date of his birth be adopted, but are for reasons given above connected with the metre absolutely inadmissible. It seems to me also that the whole tone of

the poem requires that the rains should have been already explained by some one in some other way; that Chaucer's mocking explanation is a parody on some serious but absurd solution that had been proposed; that his poem is a satiric refutation of the doctrine once so universally, still so widely, spread, that there is an indissoluble link between the events of the outer material world, and the good or evil deeds of man. This consideration, along with those of style and metre, leads me to adopt the year 1382, which curiously enough is the only one of the four which does not mention a pestilence as following the rains, an omission which has probably led to the critics fixing on other years.

For the allusions, as I have not any of the chroniclers at hand, I will quote the somewhat condensed account given in Kennet's *Complete History of England*, and founded on Holinshed, for the most part, for the history of the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV: 'John Northampton, alias Comberton, Mayor of London, observing with sorrow the lewdness and debaucheries of the citizens, set himself with all diligence to suppress them; and severely punished all such as he found guilty of whoredom, by imprisoning both sexes, and causing the women to be carried through the streets of London with their hair shorn, as thieves were in those days usually exposed to shame, with trumpets and pipes going before them; nor did he spare the men more. The bishops pretending that the punishment of such immorality belonged to their jurisdiction rather than the mayor's, were highly displeased with him and forbade him; but that did not in the least deter him from proceeding in so good a work, so long as his power lasted, though against the bishops' will, who ought to have encouraged him. Whether this uneven zeal of the churchmen against opinions and doctrines more than vicious practices, were the cause of those fearful judgments which happened at the same time they were carrying on their persecutions, is hard for us peremptorily to determine; but certain it is that many heavy calamities befell the nation at this time. Such an earthquake was felt, as not only wrought great terrors in the inhabitants, but shook down divers churches and houses in the nation, and principally in Kent.' Chaucer was living in Kent. 'Not many days after happened a water-shake, as it was called, which beat the ships in the havens so violently together that many received no small damage. And about St Thomas' Day there fell such great rains, as caused mighty inundations, which drowned many villages, and carried away divers bridges.' This was

also the year in which the memorable act was passed ‘which began the first persecution that ever was among the English for the Christian religion, on the followers of Wickliffe,’ as preachers of heresy, by authority of which the bishops ‘cruelly imprisoned them, and punished them as they pleased.’ ‘This act was not passed by the consent of the commons, but was fraudulently procured of the king by the bishops, to gratify their own bloody malice against those whom they pleased to call heretics.’ Hence the allusion to ‘uneven zeal’ above.

Now to these proceedings every word of Chaucer’s poem is applicable. This is his argument. Some say that these miraculous rains are caused by God’s anger at churchmen caring more for heresy than for crime; some say that devotion to Venus has been the cause of them. Absurd! How could these rains from Venus’s own sphere be caused by her being worshipped too much? How could the high planetary seven be affected by mortal passions? No: Skogan is the cause; not too much, but too little worship of Venus causes her to weep: not Lollards’ heresy, but Skogan’s blasphemy of her, makes her drown us in her tears. Skogan gave up his lady for want of pity; let him repent and sue to her for pardon. The pungency which this poem would have at that date, the satire of the faults of the clergy, the absence of superstition, the good-humoured kindliness of banter, are thoroughly Chaucerian. Nor is the date 1382 inconsistent with 1340 as the date of Chaucer’s birth; he may have had grey hairs and been fat at forty-two, although I incline to the old date of 1328, as there seems not to be a shadow of argument against it, but a series of hypotheses.

But leaving this question of date, we come to another: this poem is a *l’envoy*; but a *l’envoy* is attached to something. The *l’envoy* that Chaucer sent to Bukton was accompanied by the *Tale of the Wife of Bath*; where is the poem which was forwarded to Skogan? I have no hesitation in saying it was the *Complaint of the Death of Pity*; how Pity is dead and buried in a gentle heart. It is sent to Skogan to show how Chaucer would have addressed his lady if ‘she saw not his distress,’ instead of giving her up at Michaelmas. I need not point out how this agrees with what I have advanced already, but I may notice how it is supported by what I shall have to add by and by.

Before coming to this, however, let us see what we know about Skogan. Speght’s *Chaucer* contains a moral ballad by Henry Skogan, which quotes the *Wife of Bath’s Tale* of

his 'master,' Chaucer. In Henry VIII's reign, Dr Andrew Borde published *Skogan's Fests*, in which he is described as king's jester and an Oxford graduate. Henry Skogan could not have been a jester (read his ballad in Speght), and very likely was not of Oxford.

In *2 Henry IV*, Act III, sc. ii, Shallow says he saw Sir John break Skogan's head at the Court gate, when he was a crack not thus high ; but Shakespeare certainly confounds him with John Skogan, jester to King Edward IV, who was, as we know on the authority of Holinshed, sometime a student in Oxford. Dr Andrew Borde's statements also apply to John Skogan. Of our Skogan, Henry that is, we know that in 1399 he was one of the many who had letters of protection on Richard II's expedition into Ireland, and he is described as Henricus Skogan, armiger. We also know that in Jonson's *Masque of the Fortunate Isles*, he appears thus :

' *Johphiel*. Methinks you should inquire now after Skelton,  
Or Master Skogan.

*Merefool*. Skogan, what was he ?

*Joh.* O, a fine gentleman, and Master of Arts,  
Of Henry the Fourth's time, that made disguises  
For the king's sons, and writ in ballad-royal  
Daintly well.

*Mere.* But wrote he like a gentleman ?

*Joh.* In rhyme, fine tinkling rhyme, and flowing verse,  
With now and then some sense ; and he was paid for 't,  
Regarded and rewarded.'

It is noticeable, however, that when Skogan and Skelton come in, Skogan talks in four-foot anapaestics and not in ballad-royal. Here the 'moral Skogan,' as Jonson afterwards calls him (compare Chaucer's 'moral Gower'), seems to be further confused with a third Skogan, a contemporary of Skelton's referred to by Drayton in his *Eglogues*.

This seems to be the extent of our knowledge of Henry Skogan. Now among the poems usually assigned to Chaucer, but now proved to be spurious, is one that is inseparably linked in subject to the *Complaint of Pity*. This poem is the *Court of Love*.

' Instead of Pity speedeth hot courâge.  
The matters all of court, now she is dead,  
I me report in this to womanhead.'

And again :

' For wail, and weep, and cry, and speak, and pray  
Women would not have pity on thy plaint ;

Ne by that mean to ease thine heart convey,  
 But thee receiven for their own talent.  
 And say that pity causeth thee in consent  
 Of routh to take thy service and thy pain,  
 In that thou mayst to please thy sovereign.'

The *Complaint of Pity* might be inserted here as an episode; and in another passage :

' When that my lady, of her cruelty,  
 Would from her heart exilen all pity,'

there is a similar allusion. The poem alludes to the *Legend of Good Women*, frequently to the 'way menting' of *Annelyda*, to *Troilus*, etc. It follows that it must have been written after 1382. The metre is clearly differentiated from Chaucer's of that date by the -y -ye rhymes, and from Chaucer's of any date by not pronouncing e final (though es or en final are pronounced), by its singular, almost modern, regularity of metre, and other minor matters. It is in fact exactly the metre that we should expect from Skogan; 'written in rhyme-royal, daintily well, in tinkling flowing verse, with now and then some sense.' There is not to my knowledge any other unassigned poem of this date that fulfils these requisites outside the covers of Speght's *Chaucer*, and when we consider also the links that unite the *Court of Love*, the *Complaint of Pity*, the *L'Envoy à Skogan* together, I feel it is more than probable that the *Court of Love* is Skogan's.\*

The only point that needs here to be explained is the humour of making the rain proceed from Venus's tears. Saturn, not Venus, was the planet that produced rain and pestilence. Saturn says in the *Knight's Tale*:

' Mine is the drenching in the sea so wan.'

And again:

' Mine looking is the father of pestilence.'

And once more, we read in the *Miller's Tale*:

' Now on Monday next at quarter night  
 Shall fall a rain.'

The sixteenth hour on Monday was dedicated to Saturn. Finally, in *Troilus and Cryseyde*:

' Saturn and Jove in Cancro joined were  
 That maden such a rain from heaven avail.'

\* Is not, however, this poem too modern for the fourteenth century at all in its present shape? It seems to me to have been rewritten by the sixteenth century editor.

So in *Piers Plowman* (see Skeat's edition of the *Astrolabie*):

'Through floods and through foul weathers fruits shall fall;  
And so said Saturn.'

But the influence of Venus is astrologically the exact opposite of Saturn's: hence the falling of rain from Venus's sphere is opposed to the laws of Nature: therefore she must be weeping; which implies some fearful delinquency among her subjects on earth. The ludicrous inadequacy of Skogan's offence for the miraculous portent to be caused by it, is the foundation of the humour and the satire displayed in this poem. Chaucer was so pleased with the conceit, that he uses it again (seriously) in his *Palamon and Arcite*. Venus's tears fall in the lists for the defeat of her champion. This fixes the date of *Palamon and Arcite* as immediately subsequent to the *L'Envoy à Skogan*; a position which cannot be assigned it, except on the hypothesis that the latter was written in 1382. It is certain, on an attentive reading of Chaucer's works, that when he repeats himself, he does so at no distant date. I could give detailed proof of this; but it would require an entire chapter.

Here, then, I leave the consideration of Skogan and his relation to Chaucer. I feel little, if any, doubt as to the connection of the *Complaint of Pity*, the *L'Envoy*, and the *Court of Love*; not much as to the authorship of the latter poem, and none whatever as to the date assigned. At any rate, the hypothesis here proposed gives for the first time a plausible account of the *Complaint of Pity*—an account which does not require us to place it at a date when Chaucer's style and metre were much less developed than in that poem, nor to interfere with the received date of his birth, nor to invent startling theories in order to account for events in his life, which all seem to me perfectly explicable without altering any of the received traditions.

It is necessary, however, to complete our subject, that I should notice the connection between the cycle of poems arising out of Chaucer's address to Skogan and the *Complaint of Pity*. The first of these is the *Court of Love*: that this cannot be Chaucer's is shown by the non-pronunciation of *e* final in nouns, adjectives, and adverbs; by its not being in the form of a dream, as all Chaucer's poems of this kind are; and by its internal evidence. It is written by Philogenet (friend of *Genista*, dependent on Plantagenet?), eighteen years old, clerk of Cambridge. It distinctly alludes to the *Complaint of Mars*, the *Annelyda and Arcite*, the *Romance*

*of the Rose, the Troylus and Cryseyde, the Parlement of Fowls, and the Legend of Good Women.* The last is most important, as it fixes the date as 1383 at earliest, long after the giving up of imperfect rhyming by Chaucer. The story shows that Philogenet did not go to Love unsent for, and has therefore difficulty in obtaining mercy. It gives the full account of the *Death of Pity and her Resurrection*, and is therefore subsequent to Chaucer's *Complaint*. It contains no allusions to Chaucer's octosyllabic poems, the *Dream, Duchess, or House of Fame*, and has one curiously un-Chaucerian expression in using 'out of drede' in its modern meaning. It is certainly an answer to the *Death of Pity*, and I think there is little doubt that the messenger who sent Philogenet to Love was Chaucer's *Envoy à Skogan*.

Immediately connected with this poem is the *Flower and the Leaf*, written by a lady, as Tyrwhitt pointed out, filled with allusions to previous poems by Chaucer; but specially linked to the *Court of Love* by 'the herber,' which plays so conspicuous a part in it (compare *Court of Love*, iv, 158, Bell); and by the *Songs of the Nightingale, Goldfinch, and Cuckoo*, which allude to the matins at the end of the *Court of Love*. The lady who writes it has very different notions to Skogan, who says :

‘ In the Court of Love to dwell for aye,  
Thy will it is, and done thee sacrifice;  
Daily with Dian eke to fight and fray,  
And holden war as might will me suffice.  
That goddess chaste I kepen in no wise  
To serve; a fig for all her chastity!  
Her law is for religiosity.’

The lady, on the contrary, declares her allegiance to the Lady of the Leaf; that is, to Diana herself.

The style is (as far as we can tell with a very corrupt text) like that of the *Court of Love*. Special phrases, a 'world of ladies,' 'goddess nature,' 'put in press,' etc., are borrowed from Chaucer; but the running on of the verses without pause, the modern tone, the general structure of the sentences, are from Skogan's poem. I think it was written by his sovereign lady, whoever she might be. Date not far from his poem, probably 1383.

From the *Flower and Leaf* is derived the plan of the *Complaint of a Lover's Life*, which was certainly by Lydgate, as Shirley says. Lydgate, in 1384, was a youth of from fourteen to seventeen years old; and this seems to be an exercise in English verse written by him, and sent to his

'master,' Chaucer, for criticism. That it was written by some one with the *Flower and Leaf* before him is manifest. The sun in Taurus is in both poems expressed by 'Phœbus entering the Bull;' the writer gets up from bed disconsolate, and goes to walk in the meadows, in both poems; in both does the writer meet with an 'herber;' in both have we the 'goddess Nature.' This last is originally Chaucer's. There are other things showing that Lydgate had Chaucer also in his eye, as well as the lady. He alludes to *Palamon and Arcite*; he has the phrase used in it and the *Legend*:

'Thus my death shopen ere my shirt;'

and he has copied the list of trees almost verbatim from Chaucer. He has also imitated Skogan's *Death of Pity* in his *Death of Truth*, and done it badly. There can be no doubt of the relation of this poem to the others.

Last in the group, the *Cuckoo and the Nightingale*, I think, is Chaucer's. No one else that I know at that date could have written it. Mr Furnival says it offends against the rhyme laws, and that Professor Ten Brink and Mr Bradshaw agree in affirming that it does so. I cannot find the offending rhymes. It is also said that Chaucer did not use this metre. He did, in the *l'envoy* to his *Complaint to his Purse*; and I do not know of any one else who uses it. This point tells, then, in my favour. I do not profess, however, to date it, except that it must lie clear of the *Canterbury Tales*; and belongs to the cycle beginning with the *Assembly of Birds*, and ending with Lydgate's *Complaint of the Black Knight*. It may, however, help us in determining its date, to notice that the two first lines in which *benedicite* is pronounced with five syllables are repeated in the *Knight's Tale*. In every other place in the *Canterbury Tales* where this word occurs, it is pronounced with three (? *ben'dcīte*). It is therefore most probable that if Chaucer had not the *Cuckoo and Nightingale* before him when he wrote the *Knight's Tale*, he would in this place also have made the word trisyllabic. I think, therefore, the *Cuckoo and Nightingale* is probably earlier than 1383. On the other hand, compare the allusion to the palace 'at Woodstock or at Shene,' with that in the *Legend of Good Women* to the palace at Eltham.

There is just one more point which I must notice as of use in distinguishing the authentic and spurious poems. Chaucer, in nearly all his poems that concern the events of his own life (in quite all, if the *Cuckoo and Nightingale* be rejected),

uses the framework of a dream in which to arrange his plot. None of the spurious poems do this; even in the *Flower and Leaf*, and in the *Black Knight*, where we should certainly have expected it, we do not find it adopted; nor in the *Court of Love*, to which it is well suited. This argument will have different value to different minds. To me the fact that all the imitators of Chaucer, whose works have got mixed with his, from being found in his papers at his death or some similar reason, carefully avoid the use of this very obvious expedient, is a strong argument in favour of the authenticity of the *Chaucer's Dream*. If we take it from him, to whom can we assign it?

Thus I have endeavoured to fulfil my promise made at the beginning of this book, as far as the limits of space would permit. I have yet to give a scheme of the order of writing of the *Tales* which cannot be wrong in more than two or three instances, inasmuch as in these only is it possible for any other order to fulfil all the conditions required. I have tried to settle the dates as near as may be of other works of his, and to show that they are not inconsistent with either the earlier date of his birth (which I believe in at present) or the later one. I have tried to reclaim for him that exquisite poem, *Chaucer's Dream*, and the translation of the *Romaunt of the Rose*; and finally, I have, I believe, fixed the date of the *L'Envoy à Skogan* by historical evidence, which not only settles the date of the poem, but introduces Chaucer to us in a new light, as the opponent of persecution for religious matters, and a defender of the Lollards.

The errors that have entrapped critics in these poems on all love matters, I believe have their root in one main mistake. They confuse the earnest real love for a mistress or a wife, with the outward formal gallantry for a 'ladie' or a 'queen,' as constituted by the courts of Love. When Chaucer writes to Skogan, or says that he knows nothing of Love, or indites 'complaints,' he is only speaking in this court of Love language. His real feelings must not be sought for here, but in his dramatic tales.\*

This is exactly the same mistake that people make as to Shakespeare's *Sonnets*; they fancy that every expression of love, devotion, etc., bears its modern meaning; they cannot understand our ancestors playing at being in love, or lord and slave. The child-like element of sport is so squeezed

\* I do not dwell on this point here, nor is it needful, it has been done by others; see for instance, R. Bell, *Chaucer*, vol. iv, introduction to the *Court of Love*.

out of modern life by the struggle for existence, that we cannot enter into the feelings of those who, living in less care-worn if not less busy times, could gambol and enjoy themselves even when 'hoar and round.' Chivalry has gone; sport has gone; science and commerce have taken their place; spontaneous art is dead; self-conscious criticism is alive and very restive. No doubt our time is the better—we all agree on that; but we should not ignore the characteristics, nor even the excellences, of the older times, when laughing and humour held their full share in our literature, and people could work for the same object without quarrelling.

This mention of Shakespeare reminds me of a great similarity in these two master minds, with the notice of which I must conclude this too long chapter. I mean their fragmentary way of working.

Chaucer left unfinished his greatest work, and the written part of it in many places uncorrected; he left also several tales in it, the *Cook's Tale*, the *Squire's*, and *Sir Thopas*, incomplete in themselves; they are fragments, whether meant to be finished or not. His next great work, the *Legend of Good Women*, he also left unfinished. His great translation, the *Romaunt of the Rose*, he wrote only to the extent of three-sevenths. The *Annellyda and Arcite* was never brought to an end; and if I am right, the *House of Fame* was written at various times, as we know his other great works were. Just in the same way Shakespeare left unfinished *Timon*, *Pericles*, the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Henry VIII*; and in my opinion wrote several other plays, *Troylus and Cressida* for example, at different times, piece-meal. I need not here enumerate from the *Fairy Queen* to the *Roman Comique* the many master-pieces that have been left us as torsos. But I do urge on critics the consideration that it is always impossible for the greatest order of minds to be other than restless; they cannot be made to complete their work unless tied like Sampson to the mill; and in all questions of chronology of the greatest works we must always examine first if the work shows signs of suture or welding; remembering that the man of one idea is so blind to everything else, that he is pretty sure to bring out all its meaning completely; but that the man of many, still more the man of very many, unless compelled by Fortune's spite to wear his motley, and exhibit himself to the crowd, is more likely to remain like Browning's Waring,

‘With no work done, but great works undone’—  
to his benefit probably, though to the world’s loss.

## CHAPTER VI.

### ON THE ORDER IN WHICH THE CANTERBURY TALES WERE WRITTEN.

No single question connected with Chaucer's works offers the difficulties of this one. The solution required has several conditions to fulfil; if it miss any of these, it fails altogether. It must, firstly, be consistent with the order of the tales, in each of Mr Bradshaw's nine groups, which are linked by prologues or chat by the way, although it is indifferent to the order of the groups themselves; secondly, it must give an intelligible account of the manner in which these prologues were written; thirdly, it must be consistent with Chaucer's mental development, showing gradual and regular growth up to the culminating point; finally, it must bear the test of metrical examination, which is always the ultimate method to be resorted to; but which, if used as a primary means of investigation, will lodge its experimenters in the same difficulties as a chemist would experience if he applied his quantitative analysis before he had qualitatively ascertained what the components were, the amount of which he is endeavouring to measure. Any scheme which satisfies all these requisitions cannot be far from the truth.

Before, however, giving my scheme, I will clear the way on one or two points. The first is important. There are three tales, the *Nun's*, the *Shipman's*, and the *Doctor's*, which, unlike all the others, have no prologues. This of itself would make us suspect that they were not originally written for their present position, as indeed, we know, the *Nun's Tale* was not. It, like the *Knight's Tale*, was published originally as a writing by Chaucer, not as a tale spoken by a woman. Traces of this remain in the tale itself:

‘Yet pray I you *that reden that I write;*’

and again:

‘And though that I, unworthy *son of Eve;*’

as pointed out in Mr Bell's notes. This tale, then, was in-

serted in the *Canterbury Tales* without such revision as the *Knight's Tale* received.

The case of the *Shipman's Tale* is somewhat different. It seems, from the use of 'we' and 'us' when speaking of women, that it was meant to be spoken by a woman. Tyrwhitt shows this from the passage:

‘The silly husband algate muste pay;  
He must *us* clothen in full good array.’

And, as Mr Furnival has rightly pointed out, the only woman it could be meant for is the Wife of Bath. I do not agree with him, however, that it was meant for the return journey. I believe that all notion of a return journey had been abandoned before this tale was written. I have no doubt, however, that the tale was meant for her. It is more in character with her prologue than that now assigned to her. Chaucer probably found that he had no one in his company to whom he could so well give her present tale; and transferred this one to the Shipman to make room for the other. And I find confirmation of this in the fact that this story suits the references made by the Merchant better than the one now allotted to the Wife; and still more in the *L'Envoy à Bukton*. This *L'Envoy*, which refers to the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (sent with the prologue of course), on marriage says, that if thou, Bukton, take a wife,

‘Thou shalt have sorrow on thy flesh thy life,  
And been thy wife's thrall.’

And again:

‘It is the chain  
Of Sathanas on which he gnaweth ever.’  
‘Sorrow and woe is in marriage.’

This does not agree with the present *Wife of Bath's Tale*:

‘And she obeyed him in everything  
That might doon him pleasure or liking;  
And thus they live unto their lives' end  
In perfect joy.’

But it does agree with the *Shipman's Tale*:

‘This merchant saw none other remedy;  
And for to chiden it n'as but folly,  
Sith that the thing might not amended be.’

This surely was the tale circulated as the *Wife of Bath's*.

The *Doctor's Tale* was evidently written at the same time with the narratives in the *Legend of Good Women*; it exactly resembles them in style and treatment, but was inserted in the *Canterbury Tales* rather than in the *Legend*, because Virginia, although 'a martyr and a good woman,' was not 'a martyr of Saint Cupid.' All tales without prologues must have been written before the general prologue in 1388, or shifted from the position originally given them.

The next point regards the tales of the *Reeve* and the *Miller*. These tales, like those of the *Friar* and the *Sumner*, are told against each other; the *Reeve* tells a tale against a miller, and the *Miller* against a reeve. But the reeve in the *Miller's Tale* is also a carpenter. This, I think, shows that Chaucer, when he wrote this pair of tales, had determined to get rid of the carpenter from his *dramatis personæ* in the main prologue, and to roll his reeve and carpenter into one. But, if this carpenter goes, the four tradesmen, his companions, must go too. This, with the omission of two of the three Nun's Priests, would reduce the company to twenty-four, the number I believe Chaucer ultimately meant to adopt. It is certain that of these five tradesmen no mention is made in any of the minor prologues, or any part of the tales subsequent to the general prologue. There is also a similar confusion between xxiv and xxix, in a passage relating to the age of John of Gaunt. Can 'nine and twenty' be a scribe's correction for xxiv, introduced to make the number nearer to that of the characters described, Chaucer having written his descriptions regardless of number, and left the selection of characters to be omitted for that final revision which he never executed? Nine-and-twenty is a strange number to choose; and we seem to have all the tales intended except the *Plowman's* and the *Knight's Yeoman's*. That the Nun's Priests were intended to be reduced from three to one, is clear from the Host's address in the singular:

'Then spake our Host with rude speech and bold,  
And said unto the Nunner Priest anon;  
"Come near, thou priest, come hither, thou Sir John!"'

Of course it is mere conjecture that Chaucer did thus intend to limit his number to twenty-four. But I cannot believe in the received twenty-nine.

I now give a table of my scheme. The tales are numbered chronologically; and arranged in that order. Those vertically under one another are in the same group, as determined

by prologues and other links; except in the case of the *Shipman's Tale*. Reasons for this exception have been given above:

- 1. Nun.
- 2. Prioress.
- 3. Man of Law.
- 4. Clerk.
- 5. Doctor.
- 6. Knight.
- General Prologue.
- 7. Squire.
- 8. Franklin.
- 9. Manciple.
- 10. Nun's Priest.
- 11. Wife of Bath.
- 12. Merchant.
- 13. Shipman.
- 14. Miller.
- 15. Reeve.
- 16. Cook.
- 17. Friar.
- 18. Sumner.
- 19. Pardoner.
- 20. Canon's Yeoman.
- 21. Sir Thopas.
- 22. Melibœus.
- 23. Monk.
- 24. Parson.

To this scheme I append some general considerations. It would be impossible in a treatise of this nature to notice all the minute critical points that have induced me to adopt this order; I can only hope to give sufficient to show its general consistency.

The first four tales are in one metre, and evidently written about the same time; they deal with 'lives of saints' and patience of wives; the first three of them are the only tales which have a preface or introduction in the tales themselves; in the first two this preface includes an address to the Virgin 'Mother of God,' which, I think, fixes the date of the separate poem of that name; it is so exactly similar in tone and matter. This is confirmed by the reference to St Bernard:

' And thou, that flower of virgins art all,  
Of whom that Bernard lust so well to write;'

for the *Mother of God* is, to the extent of six stanzas, taken

from his writings. There are similar introductions in the *House of Fame*, *Death of Blanche*, *Troylus and Cryseyde*, etc. Chaucer finally abandoned them on beginning to write in heroic metre: we shall not meet with them again.

It is singular that the first of these tales should be about a virgin martyr, whose name, Cecilia, is the same as that of the lady Cecilia de Champagne, who executed a deed of release 'de raptu meo' to Chaucer in May 1380. It is also singular that his first long narrative poem should be concerning the 'raptus' of Cressida, in which the circumstances (including a forgiveness of Pandarus by Cressida, which corresponds to that of Chaucer by Cecilia de Champagne) are of his own introduction, and different from those in the authorities he made use of.

The date of this group is certainly the latter half of 1374. We have seen above that the *Nun's Tale* was inserted without adaptation to the sex of its narrator, and there are expressions in the other tales pointing to a similar conclusion for the other tales. The following expressions look more like those of a writer than a speaker. The Prioress says, 'Guideth my song, O blissful queen.' The Clerk says, 'Petrark writeth this story, which with high style he editeth.' In the prologue, on the other hand, written after the *Canterbury Tales* had been planned and the general prologue written in 1388, the Clerk says he 'learned it of Petrarch in Padua.' I think the *writeth* of the former passage is conclusive against this being an autobiographical fragment of Chaucer's own life. Of course the end of the tale from 'But oo word, lordes,' onward, and the *Envoy* were added when Chaucer fitted on the *Merchant's Tale* much later.

In the *Man of Law's Tale* we find Chaucer's first expressions of irony as to wives, which increase in number and vigour as the tales go on :

‘Husbands ben alle good, and han ben yore,  
They knownen wives; I dare say no more.’

(Certainly not. Mrs Chaucer was alive.)

We also find in this tale a passage which seems to imply that at this time Chaucer believed in astrology. After speaking of—

‘Infortunate, ascendant, tortuous,  
Out of his angle into the darkest house,’ etc.,

he goes on :

' Imprudent emperor of Rome, alas !  
 Was there no philosopher in all thy town ?  
 Is no time bet than other in such a case ?  
 Of voyage is there none election ?'

We shall see that by and by he looks on astrology as pagan and fabulous.

This tale is not only connected with the preceding by its addressing the Virgin, by its miracles, by its praise of virginity, but with the following by its 'emperor's daughter,' and many small points of similarity; such, for example, as the use of the word 'bless' in the sense of *make the sign of the cross*; the term in the late tales is 'crouch.' We have also the same irony as to women :

' There can no man in humbless him equit  
 As women can, ne can be half so true  
 As women been, but it be fall of new.'

The next two tales, the *Doctor's* and the *Knight's*, were unquestionably written with or just before the *Legend of Good Women*. This poem mentions a version of the *Knight's Tale* as *Palamon and Arcite*. I date the *Legend*, for reasons already given, in 1383; it must be placed after 1382. The *Knight's Tale* retains a bit of its unrevised shape in—

' Who couthe rhyme in English properly  
 His martyrdom ?'

which clearly indicates a written poem, not a spoken tale. It is closely connected with poems of the date 1382-3 by many allusions : for instance, the word 'martyrdom' alludes to the martyrs of St Cupid in the *Legend*. Again :

' Shapen was my death erst than my shirt.'

Compare *Legend*:

' Since first that day that shapen was my shirt,  
 Or by the fatal suster had my doom.'

Moreover, Saturn (he still uses astrology as a serious motive) is mentioned as the lord of 'the drenching in the sea so wan,' and as saying :

' Mine looking is the father of pestilence.'

We have seen that this connects this poem with the *L'Envoy à Skogan*; so does the weeping of Venus :

' Till that the teares in the listes fall.'

The description of the tournament is also certainly of the same date as the battle in the Cleopatra story in the *Legend*; they are too long to quote here, but should be referred to. There is also the same irony as to women, which we have noticed in the preceding tales :

‘ When that their husbands been from them ago  
That for the more part they sorrowen so,  
That atte laste certainly they die.’

The list of trees (i, 182) may be compared with that in the *Assembly of Fowls* (iv, 195).

It will be noticed that three out of the *six* tellers of stories up to this point are the three called on by the Host in the general prologue, in order that one of them may tell the first tale. There can be no reasonable doubt that the prologues to these three (the *Knight's*, the *Priores*, and the *Clerk's*) were written, the *Knight's Tale* revised, and the general prologue composed at one date. This is fixed by Mr Brae at 1387-8.

The *Man of Law's Tale* must have been introduced at the same time. It will be noticed that these *six* tales which precede the main prologue are all head tales of six of the nine groups arranged by Mr Bradshaw. The three other head tales (*Squire's*, *Wife's*, *Manciple's*) must, as we shall see, come later.

The next group of tales in order of time is that in which the scene is laid in Faery, or involves some mythological element.


In the *Squire's* we have a positive proof that it was written after the general prologue, since in the tale (not in the prologue to it) the Squire says :

‘ I will not tarien you, for it is pryme.’

This must not only have been written after the pilgrimage had been arranged in Chaucer's mind, but also after he had determined to make it a two days' journey, as I shall try to show in the next chapter. In like manner, the interruption of the Host is so linked with the tale of *Sir Thopas* that this also must have been written after the Host's character had been developed, and therefore after the general prologue.

The *Squire's Tale* is unfinished, and with this fragment the serious tales are brought to a conclusion.

We now enter on a series that is concerned with the relation between husband and wife. They continue the irony



already noticed, but grow coarser and coarser till they culminate in the *Miller* and the *Reeve*.

In the *Franklin's Tale*—

‘ Such lordship as men have o'er their wives,’

strikes the key-note, continued in one long, though varied, repetition through the series.

‘ Who couthe tell, but he had wedded be,  
The joy, the ease, and the prosperity  
That is betwix a husband and a wife ? ’

Again :

‘ For his absence weepeth she and siketh ;  
As doth those noble wives, when hem liketh.’

We must recollect that Mrs Chaucer died in 1387, the year before the main prologue was written, and probably that in which these tales were planned.

And now we meet with a distinct declaration that astrology is a humbug. Chaucer speaks of—

‘ Operations  
Touching the eight and twenty mansions  
That longen to the moon ; and such folly,  
As in our dayes n'is not worth a fly.’

He calls it

‘ a superstitious cursedness,’

and speaks of—

‘ his other observances  
As heathen folk used in thilke days.’

I may also note here, once for all, a habit Chaucer has of telling his tales about characters corresponding to those who have already been introduced as reciters. Thus in this tale we have a clerk, a squire, and a knight, and every one of these characters is included in the list of those who have already told tales. This may be accidental, but I do not think so.

In the *Nun's Priest's Tale* we have a continuation of the depreciation of astrology ; for the Cock has his astronomical knowledge by mere instinct :

‘ He knew by kind, and by none other lore.’

We have also that delicious bit of irony as to women :

‘ For all as siker as *in principio*  
*Mulier est homini's confusio* :

(Madam, the sentence of this Latin is,  
Woman is mannes joy and mannes bliss) ;’

which, with the consideration that we are still in the land of Fable or Faery, fixes the date of this tale, or group of tales, to the place I have assigned to it.

The irony as to women is continued by the Manciple :

‘ All these ensamples tell I by these men  
That been untrue, and nothing by women.’

The ensamples being a bird, a cat, and a she-wolf, all presumably feminine. The tales of the Crow and Chanticleer are also linked by the general moral. Compare—

‘ Nay, quod the fox, God give him mischance,  
That is so undiscreet of governance,  
That jangleth when he should hold his peace ;’

with—

‘ Keep well thy tongue, and think upon the Crow !

In the *Wife of Bath's* prologue we meet first with that coarse indecency of language which repels many modern readers from Chaucer, but which is very characteristic of some men in their climacteric. Chaucer himself describes such :

‘ We olde men, I dreade, so fare we,  
Till we be rotten, can we not be ripe ;  
We hoppen alway while the world will pipe,  
For in our will there sticketh e'er a nail,  
To have a hoar head and a greene tail,  
As hath a leek ; for though our might be done,  
Our will desireth folly e'er in one.  
For when we may not do, then will we speak :  
Yet in our ashen old is fire yreke.’

—Reeve's Prologue.

Chaucer is not the only great poet who has in his old age displayed this tendency.

In the Wife's praise of marriage, Chaucer's satire on women reaches its climax. Extracts I have not room for, and it should be read entire. I can only notice one hard hit at Chaucer himself, which confirms what I have said above :

‘ Mercury loveth wisdom and science,  
And Venus loveth riot and dispense ;  
And Venus faulth where Mercury is raised.  
Therefor no woman of clerkes is praised :  
The clerk, when he is old, and may not do  
Of Venus' workis, is not worth a scho :  
Then sit he down, and write in his dotage,  
That women cannot keep their marriage.’

And also :

' For trusteth well it is an impossible  
 That any clerk shall speke good of wives,  
 But if it be of holy seintes' lives,  
 He of none other wives ne'er the mo,  
 Who peynted the leoun, tell me, who ? '

This must all refer to Chaucer ; the 'seintes' lives' is conclusive. Is it possible that this prologue, which, with or without its tale, was circulated as a separate work, can be the book of *Leo*, spoken of at the end of the *Parson's Tale*, because in it the women give an account of themselves ? In any case this prologue is the key to much of Chaucer's life. This, however, can only be developed in a monograph. I must pass on. The Wife is made to believe, after her womanly fashion, in astrology ; but only by way of ironical expression of the weakness of woman's intellect. In this tale, by-the-by, we have the first mention of miracle plays by our author : they are again alluded to in the *Miller's Tale* and prologue. In this *Wife's Tale* and prologue we have also the commencement of the satire on the religious orders, which is henceforth never dropped, but goes on increasing to the end of the series. The Limiter, the Sumner, the Pardoner, all come in for some touches. The Wife's statement of the Limiter—

' In every bush, and under every tree,  
 There is none other incubus than he,'

is followed up by the Merchant's irony :

' And followed aye his bodily delight  
 On women there as was his appetite,  
 As done these fooles that been secular.'

And again :

' He which hath no wife I hold him shent,  
 He liveth helpless, and is all desolate.  
 I speak of folk in secular estate.'

And so in other passages.

The satirical allusion to 'old widows,' the obedience of wives merely of courtesy, the 'knowing where the shoe pinches,' the mention of 'fayery,' connect this tale with the *Wife* on the one hand ; while the whole conduct of the story, the 'rising before prime,' and many small coincidences in language, link it to the *Shipman* on the other.

Of the *Shipman's Tale* I have already treated. I have only to notice, in confirmation, that it is impossible that it

could have been written before the *Prioress's*. Chaucer must therefore have prefixed it to her group, a method of procedure which he never adopted in any other instance. I think that when he determined not to write a return journey, he stuck the Prioress' prologue to the end of this story, and put them in their present position.

The *Miller* and the *Reeve* need not detain us here—they clearly are in their place. The *Miller* not only satirises astrology, but mentions the 'astrolabie,' which instrument Chaucer was certainly now studying (1389-90), in preparation for his treatise on it in 1391. The satire on the clergy also grows more developed. Absolon, the parish clerk, and therefore in minor orders, has by no means a dignified part assigned him, and the miller's wife is the daughter of a parson. I must, however, notice here a trait which seems to me to confirm the traditional date of Chaucer's birth in 1328. The miller's daughter is twenty years old, and the infant in the cradle only a few months. The girl in Boccaccio's story is fifteen or sixteen. Why did Chaucer adopt the number twenty? I think because the difference of age between his own children was the same as that between the miller's. If the traditional dates are true, Chaucer was married in 1360, and his son Thomas was born in 1361. Lewis's birth is fixed 1381 by the address to him in the *Astrolabie*. They, like the miller's children, are just twenty years apart. He could thus appeal to a known fact in answer to the palpable objection that the incident was improbable. In the same way I take the age of the knight in the *Miller's Tale* (past sixty) to represent Chaucer's own. If born in 1328, he would be sixty-two in 1390. But to give all my reasons for this would lead to a too long digression.

The tales in the remaining group are clearly linked. They treat of the errors and excellences of the clergy, the *Parson* (in whom the Host smells a Lollard) being the only one selected for praise. The chief point to note for our present purpose is the gradual introduction of the subject of preaching in the *Friar's*, *Pardoner's*, and *Parson's Tales*. The *Pardoner* is certainly intended for a direct contrast to the *Parson* in this respect. They thus continue the satire in the preceding group on the clerics, and expand it in full detail. We should also note that the prose style of the *Parson* is in rhythm, manner, and structure quite other than the *Melibæus*, and that these must be separated by some years. I place the *Parson's Tale* late—say in 1397-9—no other tale being subsequent to the *Astrolabie*, the style of

which is intermediate between that of the *Melibæus* and that of the *Parson*.

The collection of tales or tragedies called the *Monk's Tale* was manifestly meant to be a pendant to the *Legend of Good Women*, bearing the same relation to Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium* that the *Good Women* does to his *De Claris Mulieribus*. Both collections were probably begun about 1382-3, though this one was not finished till after the *Melibæus*, c. 1393. With it should be compared the passage on fortune in this latter story (iii, 160).

With regard to the prologues, it will suffice to say that, except those to the *Man of Law*, *Clerk*, and *Knight*, which were certainly written in 1388 with the general prologue, they were probably composed each with the tale that follows it, not, except in one or two instances, with the tale preceding.

For these and other more minute reasons, I have arranged the tales in the order of my table, not that the grounds here given are exhaustive, or nearly so, but that I cannot here introduce more detail—there is too much already. Let us rather examine the table by a few general considerations, and see if it will stand testing.

1. Does it agree with my metrical rule, deduced from his other works—that heroics and royal rhymes (except in ballads) must not overlap in chronology?—Yes; tales 1-4 are in rhyme-royal, and no others are so.

2. Does it classify the tales as to subject-matter—for no one can read Chaucer carefully without seeing that his satiric, humorous, and serious poems fall into such distinct groups that they must have been written at different epochs?—Yes; tales 1-7 are serious; 8-21 are humorous (satirising married life); 22 and 24 are satiric (treating of the clergy).

3. Does there exist a development of dramatic power (so well named by Mr Hales 'power of characterisation') in our order of the tales?—Certainly, with nearly the same divisions as those of subject-matter. It is singular, but very characteristic of Chaucer, that these divisions are separated by unfinished tales—the *Squire's* ending the serious, and the *Cook's* the humorous division. Just in the same way the unfinished *Annellyda* and *Arcite* and the unfinished *Legend of Good Women* bring to a close sub-periods of this work.

4. Are there overlappings of secondary import connecting these groups?—Yes; faery and magic extend through tales 7-11, connecting the two first groups; and satire on the clergy begins incidentally in 11, and goes on increasingly to the end, connecting the two last groups.

5. It is very noticeable that all the tales, from 14 to 20 (except 19, which may have been enlarged from an earlier sketch—I think it was), have their scene laid in our own country, even where it is not so in the original tales imitated by Chaucer. None of the others have, but 12 and 13, the next preceding, have their scene in accessible countries and recent times. All before and after these belong in time and space to the distant and the fabulous.

I feel, then, tolerably confident, on all grounds, that we have here the true order of composition. That most of the tales were written before 1393 I feel sure, for this among many reasons: There are versions of the *Man of Law's*, the *Wife of Bath's*, and the *Doctor's Tales* in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*. The notion that Chaucer took these tales from Gower is to me incredible. It is not Chaucer that addresses Gower as his master, but the converse.

Nor can I accept the hypothesis that Chaucer, in 1400, died at the age of sixty or younger. The many allusions to his old age in his poems, as early, at any rate, as 1382, when he would on that hypothesis be only forty-two years old, would far outweigh all adverse considerations were there no evidence adducible of other kinds.

*Note.*—In this chapter Mr Bradshaw's groups are strictly adhered to with one exception.\* The *Nun's Priest's Tale* is looked on as an earlier written tale, without prologue, afterwards picked up by Chaucer, and connected with the *Monk's Tale* by the prologue. Should, however, the *Nun's Priest's Tale* be regarded as inseparably linked with the *Monk's*, the following alternative arrangement is quite possible:

All in one group (Prioress).	10. Wife of Bath. 11. Sir Thopas. 12. Melibœus. 13. Monk. 14. Nun's Priest. 15. Merchant. 16. Shipman and Wife of Bath's Prologue.
---------------------------------	--

The rest following in order as given in the table. In this case the *Envoy à Bukton* and *A.B.C.* would probably come with the *Monk's Tale*, date 1389-90. But on the whole, at present I prefer the arrangement in the text.

\* The *Shipman's* position I have explained in the text.

## CHAPTER VII.

### ON THE ORDER IN WHICH CHAUCER'S 'CANTERBURY TALES' SHOULD BE ARRANGED.

I NOW give a brief statement of this final problem, and a solution which, it is hoped, will be more satisfactory than any as yet proposed. The utmost conciseness will be attempted that is consistent with clearness, because very full details are already accessible in the valuable publications of the Chaucer Society.

The annexed table gives all the evidence we have on the matter—namely, the order of the tales in the ordinary editions, the names of the tellers of them, the groups into which they are divisible, and the marks of place and time contained in the tales or the prologues to them. The links connecting the tales within each group are not noted here, as Mr Bradshaw has conclusively shown that the tales are necessarily to be divided into the nine groups here given. To the same investigator we owe the settlement of the order of the five groups headed G., which are fixed by geographical considerations. I may mention that many years ago I attempted to solve this problem, and got as far as the division into groups, but not seeing Mr Bradshaw's point that G. 2 group had got shifted from its place between G. 1 and G. 3, because Rochester lies between Deptford and Sittingbourne, I threw aside the whole investigation as unprofitable.

I should also state that all references are made to volume and page of Bell's edition (eight vols.) as most convenient on the whole to the student, and that in the quotations, names, etc., the spelling is modernised, so far as metre will permit (as in Cowden Clarke's *Riches of Chaucer*), wherever the sense only of the passage is the question in hand; but when any critical question is involved, the antique spelling is preserved. This seems the best course, until the text is accurately settled.



## TABLE.

## Prologue.

(Southwark.)

## Group G. I.

1. Knight's Tale.
2. Miller's.  
(Deptford, past prime.)
3. Reeve's.
4. Cook's.

## Group O. 3.

5. Man of Law's.  
(10 A.M.)

## Group G. 3.

6. Wife of Bath's.  
(Before Sittingbourne.)
7. Friar's.
8. Summoner's.  
(Almost at town = Sittingbourne.)

## Appendix to Group G. 3.

9. Clerk's.
10. Merchant's.  
(With reference to Wife of Bath's Tale.)

## Group O. 2.

11. Squire's.  
(Prime. ? 6 A.M.)
12. Franklin's.

## Group G. 4.

13. Second Nun's.  
(Boughton-under-Bla.)
14. Canon's Yeoman's.

## Group O. 1.

15. Doctor's.  
(Beforenoon.—Furnival.)
16. Pardoner's.

## Group G. 2.

17. Shipman's.
18. Prioress'.
19. Sir Thopas.
20. Meliboeus.
21. Monk's.  
(Rochester.)
22. Nun's Priest's.

## Group G. 5.

23. Manciple.  
(Bob-up-and-down.)
24. Parson's.  
(4 P.M. Canterbury.)

Of the twenty-four tales it will be seen at once that the mere geographical order of the towns—Deptford, Dartford, Rochester, Sittingbourne, Canterbury—fixes absolutely the arrangement of seventeen contained in groups marked G. I., G. 2, G. 3, G. 4, G. 5, and the reasons given for the position of the *Clerk's* and *Merchant's Tales* as following G. 3 in the *Temporary Preface* issued by the Chaucer Society are also quite satisfactory. We have then nineteen tales fixed in position, and five in the three groups marked O. 1, O. 2, O. 3, unfixed and movable. On the positions assigned to these the present paper is written.

Mr Furnival's scheme places O. 3 between G. 1 and G. 2, O. 2 between G. 3 and G. 4, and O. 1 between G. 2 and G. 3. My scheme places O. 1 between G. 1 and G. 2, O. 2 and O. 3

between G. 2 and G. 3. The amount of alteration is precisely the same in each case. The decision between the schemes must depend solely on the internal probability of the order ultimately attained. Compare then :

## MR FURNIVAL'S SCHEME.

*First Day.* (4 Tales.)

Knight.  
Miller.  
Reeve.  
Cook.

*Second Day.* (7 Tales.)

Man of Law.  
Shipman.  
Prioress.  
Sir Thopas.  
Milibœus.  
Monk.  
Nun's Priest.

*Third Day.* (7 Tales.)

Doctor.  
Pardoner.  
Wife of Bath.  
Friar.  
Summoner.  
Clerk.  
Merchant.

*Fourth Day.* (6 Tales.)

Squire.  
Franklin.  
Second Nun.  
Canon's Yeoman.  
Manciple.  
Parson.

## MY SCHEME.

*First Day.* (12 Tales.)

Knight.  
Miller. } Before  
Reeve. } 10 A.M.  
Cook.  
Doctor.  
Pardoner.  
Shipman.  
Prioress.  
Sir Thopas.  
Milibœus.  
Monk.  
Nun's Priest.

*Second Day.* (12 Tales.)

Squire.  
Franklin. } Before  
Man of Law. } 10 A.M.  
Wife of Bath.  
Friar.  
Summoner.  
Clerk.  
Merchant.  
Second Nun.  
Canon's Yeoman.  
Manciple.  
Parson.

Now consider these arguments :

1. The tales are equally divided between the days in one scheme ; in the other, there are four in the first day, seven in the second, nearly twice as many.
2. The journeys of fifteen miles a day are too short. The instance of King John, adduced in their favour, tells against the hypothesis. He travelled his fifteen miles *after dinner*. The pilgrims were on the road from prime to four P.M. on the

fourth day to accomplish ten miles! On the two days' journey scheme they have from six A.M. to four P.M. to do thirty miles in; their rate of travelling on the Canterbury road (a good Roman one) would be five to six miles per hour, as they did not often trot, but pace or amble for the most part. They would thus get four hours for stoppage on the road, for breakfast, dinner, etc., and six hours for actual riding.

3. It is improbable that the pilgrims should start at prime on the first and fourth days, but not till ten A.M. or thereabouts on the second and third. It is much more likely that the only two mentions of 'prime' in the prologues should indicate the only two startings for a two days' journey.

4. In all cases of emendation it is incumbent on us to show how the error we emend may have arisen; and even in cases where the emendation is certain this is advisable—much more where conjecture enters largely. Now, curiously enough, in these groups of tales the G. groups, from G. 2 to G. 4, contain no notes of time; the O. groups contain no notes of place. But it is in these groups (tales 5-22) that displacement has arisen. No one doubts the position of groups G. 1 and G. 5. Now, on this I base my explanation. Taking my order of the tales as the original one, we can easily see how the tales became confused. Suppose them written at different times and arranged in groups labelled thus:

- Group 1.* Tales 1-4, G. 1 (*prime to 10 A.M.*).
- Group 2.* Tales 15-22, O. 1, G. 2 (*after 10 A.M.*).
- Group 3.* Tales 11, 12, O. 2 (*prime to 10 A.M.*).
- Group 4.* Tales 5-10, O. 3, G. 3 (*after 10 A.M.*).
- Group 5.* Tales 13, 14, G. 4.
- Group 6.* Tales 23, 24, G. 5.

Now, from the similarity of their endorsements, suppose group 4 to have been put in the place of group 2, and group 2 put into the second day to replace group 4; and further suppose group 5 to have slipped, from having no endorsement of time, and the present common arrangement of the tales will be accounted for. It is true, that exactly the same amount of displacement will produce Mr Furnival's scheme; but I cannot find any reasonable explanation for his displacement having happened.

It only now remains to refute an objection that may be made. It may be said that groups O. 1 and O. 2 certainly are unattached, but that O. 3 is linked; that the *Man of Law's*

*Tale* is united to the *Shipman's* by the use of the word 'thrifty.' The Man of Law says, before telling his tale:

‘I can no *thrifty* tale sain,’

And the Host says after a tale (I think the *Pardoner's*):

‘This was a *thrifty* tale.’

The Host also speaks of ‘men of lore,’ which seems to allude to the Man of Law's learning. But I cannot see why the Doctor's and Pardoner's learning should not be alluded to by the Host as probably as the Man of Law's. Their tales are full of it. And as to the ‘thrifty tale,’ even if it is the right reading (and the Harleian MS.\* is against it), it is poor evidence. The Man of Law may in using it be alluding to a tale of the previous day. ‘I can tell no such tale as that you had told yesterday.’ And it certainly seems to me that his

\* I am at present unable to give an opinion as to the relative excellence of the Harleian and Ellesmere MSS. If the reading, however, of the Harleian MS. is adopted in this passage, ‘non other’ for ‘no thrifty,’ we have a clear allusion to what Chaucer says in the prologue to *Sir Thopas*:

‘For other tale certes can I non  
But of a rym I lerned yore agoon.’

The parallel passage in the *Man of Law's* prologue is :

‘But natheles certeyn  
I can right now none other tale seyn  
That Chaucer, thay he can but lewedly  
On metres and on ryming craftely  
Hath seyd hem in such Englisch as he can,  
Of olde time as knoweth many man.’

This looks like one of the ‘inseparable links’ that have done such good service in this matter in the hands of Professor Ten Brink and Mr Bradshaw. This would confirm my conjecture that the list of good women is meant to allude ‘sidelings’ to Chaucer. As to the above MSS., compare carefully the following statements, both from Mr Furnival's writings : (1) That the MSS. of the Ellesmere order are called by Mr Bradshaw *Edited Texts*; that the marks of an *Edited Text* or *Text C.* are, ‘*Gamelyn* cut out, link after *Man of Law* cut out,’ etc., etc.; and that the Harleian MS. is *Text B.* (2) That the Ellesmere or *A.* type of MSS. is superior to the *B.* or Corpus-Lansdowne type, and the better *C.* type, of which the Harleian is the only representative. These statements are condensed (1) from *Temporary Preface*, p. 24 and note; (2) from *Recent Work at Chaucer*, p. 10. I shall be very thankful to any one who will give me an explanation of them.

enumeration of the tales told by Chaucer has more force and humour if introduced after Chaucer has told his two tales *incognito* than it can have if brought forward before Chaucer's performance. There is something very happy in his enumerating a list of the Good Women when Chaucer has, unknown to him, been showing the company talents so different in the tales of *Sir Thopas* and *Melibæus*.

It may be worth noticing, though I lay no stress on it, that one of the spurious prologues to the *Doctor's Tale* is in the metre of *Gamelyn*, and probably by the same hand. This looks as if the writer of *Gamelyn* meant the *Doctor* to follow the *Cook*.

On the whole, then, I see reason to prefer a two days' arrangement to a four days'. I would take the Pilgrims to Dartford before dinner, and let them sleep at Rochester; then to Sittingbourne or Ospringe to dinner, and to Canterbury the same day. This leaves everything in the arrangement probable and symmetrical, and with unlinked pauses, in which the *Plowman's*, the *Knight's Yeoman's*, and any other tales yet unwritten, might have been inserted; for instance, after the *Cook's Tale* or the *Pardoner's*. But although I feel strongly that this is the right order of the tales, I am bound to acknowledge that I could not have arrived at it without Mr Bradshaw's note as to the geographical evidence. When first I separated the tales into the nine groups, not having taken into account the improbability of the return journey entering into Chaucer's work before he finished the first one, I threw the whole thing aside as hopelessly confused, and only took it up again on the receipt of Mr Furnival's kind gift of his *Temporary Preface*.

## EDITIONS OF CHAUCER'S WORKS.

<i>Works</i> by Francis Thynne, . . .	Thomas Godfray, . . .	1532. F. 1.
“ including <i>Plowman's Tale</i> , . . .	John Reynes, . . .	1542. F. 2.
“ with additions by John Stowe, . . .	John Kingston for John Wight, . .	1561. F. 3.
“ by Thomas Speght, . . .	Adam Islip for Geo. Bishop and John Wight, . .	1598. F. 4.
“ “ “ . . .	Adam Islip, . . .	1602. F. 5.
“ by John Urry, . . .	“ “ “ . . .	1687. F. 6.
<i>Canterbury Tales</i> , . . .	William Caxton, . . .	1475. F. 1.
“ . . .	“ . . .	1481-2. F. 2.
“ . . .	Wynken de Worde, . . .	1495. F. 3.
“ . . .	Richard Pynson, . . .	1498. F. 4.
“ . . .	“ . . .	1526. F. 6.
<i>Troylus and Cryseyde</i> , . . .	W. Caxton, . . .	n. d. F.
“ . . .	W. de Worde, . . .	1517. Q. 1.
“ . . .	R. Pynson, . . .	n. d. F.
<i>Assembly of Fowls</i> , . . .	W. de Worde, . . .	1530. F.
<i>Book of Fame</i> , . . .	W. Caxton, . . .	n. d. F.
“ . . .	R. Pynson, . . .	1526. F.
<i>Mars and Venus</i> , . . .	Julianus Notarii, . . .	n. d. Q.
<i>Scipio's Dream (Parlement of Birds)</i> , . . .		
<i>Good Counsel</i> , . . .		
<i>Annelyda and Arcite</i> , . . .		
<i>Complaint to his Purse</i> , . . .		
<i>Envoy</i> , . . .		
With poems by Lydgate, etc., . . .	Caxton or De Worde, . . .	n. d. Q.

Of modern editions,

- Tyrwhitt's *Canterbury Tales* (for essays, etc.),
- Wright's “ (for numbered lines),
- Bell's *Works* (for notes, etc.),
- Morris's *Works* (for text),

are the most useful.

There is no space in this small work to give a satisfactory account of the MSS. For this see the Chaucer Society's publications.

Part II.



GUIDE TO SPENSER.





# GUIDE TO SPENSER.



## INTRODUCTION.

THIS *Guide* is published for nearly the same reasons as the *Guide to Chaucer*. There is no satisfactory compendium in existence of the facts connected with the works of Spenser, their chronological arrangement, and the critical questions involved in them. On the other hand, less space is needed than in the case of the earlier poet, for these reasons:

1. There is an excellent cheap edition (the *Globe*) of Spenser's works, with a life of the poet by Mr Hales, which leaves little to be desired (except in the portions where he speaks of Shakespeare, which are demonstrably erroneous). It is only for completeness' sake that the life of Spenser is in this *Guide* touched on at all. The text in the *Globe* edition is admirably edited by Dr Morris, and Spenser's letters, etc., are given in full.

2. Spenser's language requires no special treatment. Where he differs from Shakespeare in grammar and use of words, it is from introducing archaisms and other affectations. His use of the northern dialect in the *Shepherd's Calendar* is rather a matter for the English Dialect Society to examine than for a popular treatise; and his interlarded Chaucerianisms can cause no difficulty that the *Guide to Chaucer* will not resolve. The glossary to the *Shepherd's Calendar*, and the general one in the *Globe* edition, are amply sufficient for the student.

On the other hand, his metrical forms have never been sufficiently attended to as a means of chronological arrangement; and the data for identifying the characters introduced in his works under pastoral names have never been tabulated.

But I need not go into details; the contents of the *Guide* will speak for themselves.

I have now completed introductions to our three greatest poets anterior to the time of the Commonwealth. Some of the lesser ones still require similar elucidations, which I hope (health and leisure permitting) to give in a future work.

## CHAPTER I.

### LIFE OF SPENSER.

EDMUND, of the ancient and honourable family of the Spensers of East Lancashire, was born in London, in East Smithfield-by-the-Tower, in 1552; was admitted as sizar at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, 20th May 1569; B.A. 16th January 1572-3; M.A. 6th June 1576. He there became acquainted with Gabriel Harvey, Edward Kirke, Thomas Preston, and John Still. In 1569 were published by Van der Noodt, without acknowledgment, six of his *Visions of Petrarch*, or *Dreams*, and fifteen sonnets from the *Visions of Bellay*, in the *Theater for Worldlings*; and before 1579 Spenser wrote his *Legends*, *Court of Cupid*, *English Poet*, *Slumber*, *Dying Pelican*, *Epithalamion Thamesis*, and *Stem-mata Dudleiana*—now all lost. On leaving Cambridge, on no good terms with the dons, in 1576, he went to the north of England, where he fell in love with Rosalinde; but before 1579 he had removed to London. In the latter year he published his *Shepherd's Calendar*, by the advice of Harvey, who recommended him to Sir Philip Sidney, by whom, in turn, he was introduced to the Earl of Leicester. He visited the seat of the Sidneys at Penshurst, in Kent, and wrote some of his early poems there. His pseudonym at that time was Immerito. He also stayed at Leicester House, Strand, in October 1579. In 1580 he had begun the *Fairy Queen*, and finished his *Nine English Comedies*. At this time he was out of favour with Burghley, the antagonist of Leicester and Essex. In July 1580 he went to Ireland, his home for the rest of his life, as secretary to Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

On 27th June 1586, according to Dr Birch, he received a grant\* from Queen Elizabeth of 3028 acres in County Cork, taken from the forfeited lands of the Earl of Desmond. He

\* But the extant grant is dated 26th October 1591.

probably made the acquaintance of Sir Walter Raleigh in Dublin about this time. In 1581 he received a lease of the lands and abbey of Enniscorthy, in Wexford County; and was appointed Clerk of Degrees and Recognisances in the Irish Court of Chancery, which office he held for seven years, till he was made Clerk to the Council of Munster, in 1588. In December 1587, he parted with his Enniscorthy lease to Richard Synot. In 1582 Lord Grey was recalled. Spenser remained in Ireland, and did not probably leave it till 1589, when he seems to have resigned his second clerkship, and visited England. During this interval (1584-9) must be placed Spenser's visiting Ludovick Briskett at his cottage near Dublin, when Spenser expounded the plan of his *Fairy Queen*. He was certainly at Dublin 18th July 1586. In October Sir P. Sidney died. Spenser probably left Dublin in 1588, and was visited in 1589 by Sir W. Raleigh at Kilcolman, and, encouraged by him, published the *Fairy Queen*, books i-iii, 23d January 1589-90. With Raleigh he had returned to England late in 1589; and in February 1590-1 Elizabeth conferred on him a pension of £50, virtually though not expressly, as poet laureate. He held this till his death. Before 27th December 1591, Spenser returned to Ireland. In the same year his *Complaints* were published. The printer mentions other poems, now lost—namely, *Ecclesiastes*, *Canticum Canticorum*, *A Se'night's Slumber*, *The Hell of Lovers*, *his Purgatory*, *The Dying Pelican*, *The Hours of the Lord*, *The Sacrifice of a Sinner*, *The Seven Psalms*. On 1st January 1591,\* when *Daphnaida* was published, Spenser must have been in London. But whether the date of the dedication of *Colin Clout's Come Home Again* to Sir W. Raleigh, 27th December 1591, be a printer's error for 1594, is a disputed point. I incline to believe that 1591 is the correct date for the dedication, but that Spenser added to the poem afterwards. Whichever date be right, Spenser was in Ireland when he wrote it. The publication of the poem took place in 1595, along with that of *Astrophel*. The *Sonnets* and *Epithalamion* (entered in the Stationers' books, 19th November 1594) must have been published almost contemporaneously. These concern Spenser's second love and marriage. In his earlier time, up to 1591 (*Colin Clout*), Spenser had celebrated his love for Rosalinde; but she did not encourage him. He married his second love, Elizabeth, in Ireland, on St Barnabas's Day 1594.

\* Not 1592. Spenser makes January his first month. See the argument to the *Shepherd's Calendar*.

We must now recur to 1593. In that year Maurice, Lord Roche, Viscount Fermoy, presented to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland three petitions—two against ‘one Edmund Spenser, gentleman,’ one against Joan Ny Callaghan, as acting ‘by suppertation and maintenance of Edmund Spenser, gentleman, a heavy adversary unto your suppliant.’ The first petition ran thus: ‘Where one Edmund Spenser, gentleman, hath lately exhibited suit against your suppliant for three ploughlands, parcels of Shanballymore (your suppliant’s inheritance), before the Vice-President and Council of Munster, which land hath been heretofore decreed for your suppliant against the said Spenser and others, under whom he conveyed; and nevertheless for that the said Spenser, being Clerk of the Council in the said province, and did assign his office unto one Nicholas Curteys, among other agreements, with covenant that during his life he should be free in the said office for his causes, by occasion of which immunity he doth multiply suits against your suppliant in the said province, upon pretended title of others,’ etc. And the third petition thus: ‘Edmund Spenser of Kilcolman, gentleman, hath entered into three ploughlands, parcel of Ballingerath, and disseised your suppliant thereof, and continueth by countenance and greatness the possession thereof, and maketh great waste of the wood of the said land, and converteth a great deal of corn growing thereupon to his proper use, to the damage of the complainant of £200 sterling. Whereunto the said Edmund Spenser appearing in person had several days prefixed unto him peremptorily to answer, which he neglected to do.’

After a day of grace given, on 12th February 1594 Lord Roche was decreed possession. Spenser was not then, nor was his memory afterwards, popular at Kilcolman.

At the end of 1595 Spenser and his wife probably came to England, and stayed there till 1597. In September 1596 he was living at Greenwich. Soon after his coming from Ireland, on 20th January 1596, the second part of the *Fairy Queen* (books iv-vi) was entered for publication, and during the same year he wrote his *Hymns to Heavenly Love and Beauty*, and the *Prothalamion*.

On 17th November 1596, Robert Bowes, English ambassador in Scotland, wrote to Lord Burghley from Edinburgh, stating the great offence of King James at parts of the *Fairy Queen* alluding to him and his mother (as Duessa). And in a letter from George Nicolson to Sir Robert Cecil, dated Edinburgh, 25th February 1597-8, it is stated that Walter Quin,

an Irishman, was answering Spenser's book, whereat the king was offended.

In 1597 he was in Ireland, and in September 1598 Queen Elizabeth wrote to the Irish government recommending him to be Sheriff of Cork. In the next month Tyrone's rebellion broke out, and Spenser fled from Kilcolman with his family, leaving one child behind. The rebels burned his house with this child in it, and Spenser died, in great distress, in England, 16th January 1598-9. His surviving sons were named Sylvanus and Peregrine. A monument was erected to him in Westminster Abbey some twenty years after by the Countess of Dorset. His widow married Roger Seckerstone before 1603. He lies near Chaucer in Westminster Abbey—a great poet by a greater. But no other of his predecessors can be compared with him. The student of English literature even now, after all the laborious investigations of the present time, finds no maker of considerable importance anterior to Spenser except Chaucer, and his contemporary the author of *Piers the Plowman*. The subjoined tables will be useful for reference.

#### AUTHORITIES FOR SPENSER'S BIOGRAPHY.

1. 1606. Camden on the Monuments of Westminster Abbey.
2. 1619-20.\* Drummond's account of Jonson's Conversations.
3. 1628. Camden's *History of Queen Elizabeth*.
4. 1633. Sir James Ware's preface to Spenser's *State of Ireland*.
5. 1662. Fuller's *Worthies of England*.
6. 1675. Edward Phillips' *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicorum*.
7. 1679. Life prefixed to Spenser's works.
8. 1687. Winstanley's *Lives of the most Famous English Poets*.

#### REFERENCES TO SPENSER'S LIFE IN HIS OWN WORKS.

1. Birthplace and family—*Prothalamion*, stanza 8.
2. Age and mother's name (Elizabeth)—*Sonnets* 60, 74.
3. Spensers of Althorpe, his relatives—Dedications: (a.) *Mother Hubbard's Tale*; (b.) *Muiopotmos*; (c.) *Tears of the Muses*.
4. The same—*Colin Clout*, l. 535, etc.
5. Early life—*Shepherd's Calendar*, ecl. xii, stanzas 4-6.
6. Cambridge—*Fairy Queen*, book iv, canto ii, stanza 34.
7. Rosalinde—E. K[irke]l's glosses on *Shepherd's Calendar*, eclogues i, iv, vi, xi, xii, and the eclogues themselves.
8. *Fairy Queen*, book vi, canto vii, stanza 35, etc. (Mirabella=Rosalinde), and canto x, stanza 25, etc. (Elizabeth).
9. Rosalinde—*Colin Clout*, l. 898 to end.
10. Enemies at Court—Dedication to *Colin Clout*; *Ruins of Time*, stanza 65, etc.; *Fairy Queen*, book vi, canto xii, stanza 41.

\* Mr Hales says 1612.

11. Gratitude to Lord Grey—Sonnet to Lord Grey prefixed to *Fairy Queen*.
12. Ireland—Sonnet to Earl of Ossory prefixed to *Fairy Queen*.
13. Kilcolman—*Fairy Queen*, book iv, canto xi, stanzas 40-44.
14. Kilcolman—*Fairy Queen*, book vii, canto vi, stanzas 36-37.
15. Raleigh's visit—*Colin Clout*, l. 57, etc.
16. Sidney—*Ruins of Time*, and *Astrophel*.

SUMMARY OF SPENSER'S CHANGES OF RESIDENCE FOR REFERENCE  
IN CHRONOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION.

Cambridge, . . .	1569-76.	London, . . .	1589-91.
Lancashire, . . .	1577-78.	Kilcolman, . . .	1591-95.
Penshurst and London, . . .	1578-80.	Greenwich & London, . . .	1595-97.
Dublin, . . .	1580-88.	Kilcolman, . . .	1597-98.
Kilcolman, . . .	1588-89.	London, . . .	1598.

Since this chapter was set up in type, I have, I believe, discovered the real name of Rosalinde. E. K. says of her: 'He (Spenser) calleth Rosalinde the widow's daughter of the glen, that is, of a country hamlet or borough, which, I think, is rather said to colour or conceal the person, than simply spoken; for it is well known, even in spite of Colin and Hobbinol, that she is a gentlewoman of no mean house, nor endowed with any vulgar and common gifts both of nature and manners.' Drayton, in his ninth eclogue, says:

'Here might you many a shepherdess have seen,  
Of which no place as Cotswold such doth yield.  
*Some of it native*, some for love, I ween,  
Thither were come from many a fertile field.  
There was *the widow's daughter of the glen*,  
Dear Rosalynde, that scarcely brookt compare,  
The moorland maiden, so admired of men;  
Bright goldy looks, and Phillida the fair.'

As the *natives* are first mentioned, Rosalynde is probably one of them. In this case the glen must be the Vale of Evesham, and in that vale we must look for her family. But Camden mentions only one family in this vale, that of the Dinleies of Charleton. But E. K. again tells us that the name Rosalinde 'being well ordered, will bewray the very name of his (Spenser's) love and mistress.' Now Rosalinde anagrammatised is Rosa Dinle, or, if spelt Rosalynde, and the *y* taken as two *i*'s, Rosa Dinlei, the very name of this family. There can be little doubt that we have here the solution of a riddle that has puzzled all the commentators on and investigators of Elizabethan literature.

## CHAPTER II.

### ON THE CHRONOLOGY, ETC., OF SPENSER'S WORKS.

SPENSER'S works naturally fall into the following divisions :

1. Poems written before 1579.
2. Shepherd's Calendar.
3. Poems written in London, 1589-91.
4. " " Ireland, 1591-5.
5. " " London, 1596.
6. Fairy Queen.
7. State of Ireland.

I shall take them in chronological order, according to the following table :

Name of Poem.	Metre.	Date of Writing.	Date of Publication.
Visions of Bellay (first form), . . . . . Visions of Petrarch, . . . . .	Blank verse, Sonnets 1-15 A, Sonnets 1-6 A, 7 B, Sonnets 1-32 and } l'envoy A, }	c. 1569. c. 1569-72. c. 1569. c. 1569-72.	1569. 1591. 1569 & 1591.
Ruins of Rome, from Bellay, . . . . .			
Virgil's Gnat, . . . . .	Ottava rima,	c. 1572-6.	1591.
Mother Hubbard's Tale, . . . . .	Heroic couplets,	c. 1576-7.	1591.
Two Hymns in Honour of Love and Beauty, . . . . .	Rhyme-royal A,	c. 1577.	1596.
Shepherd's Calendar, . . . . .	Various,	1577-8.	1579.
Visions of the World's Vanity, . . . . .	Sonnets B,	c. 1589- . . .	1591.
Ruins of Time, . . . . .	Rhyme-royal A,	c. 1589-90.	1591.
Muiopotmos, . . . . .	Ottava rima,	c. 1589-90.	1590-1.
Tears of the Muses, . . . . .	Six-line heroics,	c. 1590.	1591.
Daphnaida, . . . . .	Rhyme-royal B,	1590.	1591.
Astrophel, . . . . .	Six-line heroics,	c. 1591.	1595.
Colin Clout's Come Home Again, . . . . .	Elegiacs,	1591-4.	1595.
Amoretti, . . . . .	Sonnets B,	1592-4.	1595.
Epithalamion, . . . . .	Stanza A,	1594-5.	1596.
Four Hymns: Heavenly Love and Beauty, . . . . .	Rhyme-royal A,	1596.	1596.
Prothalamion, . . . . .	Stanza B,	1596.	1596.
Fairy Queen, cantos i-iii, . . . . . iv-vi, . . . . .	Spenserian and sonnets B prefixed,	{ 1580-89. 1591-5.	1590. 1596.
View " " of the State of Ireland, . . . . .	Prose,	1596.	1633.

1. *Visions of Bellay.*

These were originally written in blank verse, and published in the *Theater for Worldlings*, as 'devised by S. John van der Noodt,' 25th May 1569. They were afterwards rewritten in sonnet form, and published in the *Complaints* as Spenser's in 1591. The blank-verse series contains four from the *Revelation* (beast, woman, white horse, and New Jerusalem) that are not in the sonnet series, and conversely there are four in the sonnet series (wolf, river, vessel, and city) not in the blank-verse series. They have no dedication prefixed.

2. *Visions of Petrarch.*

These also (except the last sonnet) were published in the *Theater for Worldlings*, in the same way as the above, without any acknowledgment of Spenser's authorship. They were reprinted, with the additional sonnet, in the *Complaints*. They are all in sonnet form. No dedication is prefixed. In the 1591 edition, 'formerly translated' is added in the title.


3. *Ruins of Rome, by Bellay.*

This series of sonnets is clearly of about the same date as the preceding. It was published in the *Complaints* in 1591, without dedication. From the style of the translation and the authorship of the original, I infer a close connection in time of production with the second form of the *Visions of Bellay*.

There can be little doubt that all the preceding sonnets (except one) were written during Spenser's undergraduate-ship, 1569-72. The one exception (the last in the Petrarch series) was probably added on the republication of 1591. It is very noticeable that these early sonnets differ in form from all Spenser's later ones. They are written in three independent quatrains and a couplet (rhyme formula, *ababcdcdefefgg*); in the later ones the quatrains are interlinked in the rhyming, and their formula is *ababbcbccdcdee*. This is an important fact in connection with the theory of metrical tests. The only other sonnet of the earlier form by Spenser is that on the *History of George Castriot*. I do not know its date, but the work was published in 1562. In 1586 we find in the sonnet to G. Harvey, that Spenser had abandoned this and adopted the later form.

4. *Virgil's Gnat.*

I have no hesitation in placing this only other translation by Spenser next in date. It is stated in the 1591 edition of



the *Complaints*, to have been 'long since dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, since deceased.' This requires an early date, and most poets begin by translations. The metre is *ottava rima*. Date, *circa* 1572-6.

### 5. *Prosopopoia (Mother Hubbard's Tale)*.

This also is an early work: it is said in the dedication to Lady Compton and Mounteagle, to have been composed 'in the raw conceit of my youth.' The general tone of the poem is so like in feeling to that shown by Harvey's letters to have been entertained by Spenser on his leaving the university, that I should date it soon after that event, *c. 1577*; in no case later than 1580. Compare l. 665:

'As if he were some great Magnifico,'

with Harvey's letter, 7th April 1580:

'For life Magnificoes not a beck but glorious in show.'

The metre is heroic couplet. The style is imitated from Chaucer (*Tityrus*).

### 6. *Two Hymns in Honour of Love and Beauty*.

These two hymns are stated in the dedication to have been composed 'in the greener times of my youth.' Many copies of them were scattered abroad, but they were not published till 1596. We shall have to recur to them under that date. They can hardly have been written except at the commencement of Spenser's passion for Rosalinde in 1577-8. There are allusions to her in the later stanzas of the *Beauty*. The metre is rhyme-royal or Chaucerian stanza.

### 7. *Shepherd's Calendar*.

This is, next to the *Fairy Queen*, the most important work of Spenser's in a critical and biographical point of view, though far from being so important, aesthetically, as other poems—for instance, the *Epithalamion*. It was written in the north, 1577-8, published in 1579, dedicated to Master Philip Sidney, with six triplets of eight-syllable lines by Immerito (Spenser), an address to G. Harvey, argument and gloss by E. K[irke], and an epilogue by Spenser in six-measure iambic couplets (Drayton's metre), from which we learn that it is meant as an imitation partly of Chaucer, partly of *Piers the Plowman*. It is made up of twelve eclogues, one for each month, beginning with January. All the pastoral names introduced in it undoubtedly belong to real

persons. Some of them are certainly identified; others are yet unknown. As an aid for the student who cares to investigate these neglected but unjustly-despised questions, I append tables showing the connections between the personages mentioned in the poem. In the first of these the symbol + shows that the character opposite to whose name it is placed, is one of the speakers in the eclogue, indicated by the number vertically above the +. The symbol x, in like manner, shows that the personage is mentioned in the eclogue. The last column gives the historical person with whom the character has been identified.


The next table gives, in the first column, the names of the interlocutors in the eclogues, and opposite each name in the second column are given the names of all the other interlocutors with whom he converses in any eclogue. This is an important aid in identification; thus, for instance, in trying to find out who Thenot is, we must notice that he is a friend of Colin (Spenser), Hobbinol (Harvey), Cuddie, etc.

The next table gives the results of the second in one diagrammatic view, a line (—) between any two characters showing that these two converse together in some eclogue or eclogues.

Finally, in the fourth table, I give a classification at once for metre and subject of the eclogues, indicating the order in which, I think, they can be best critically studied.

Name of Character.	Number of Eclogue.												Person designated.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Colin, . . .	+	..	..	x	..	+	..	..	..	..	+	+	Spenser.
Rosalinde, . .	x	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	..	..	x	x	Spenser's love, Rosa Dixie.
Hobbinol, . .	x	..	..	+	..	+	..	..	x	..	..	x	Harvey.
Thenot, . .	..	+	..	+	..	..	..	..	..	..	+	..	
Tityrus, . .	..	x	..	..	..	x	..	..	..	..	..	x	Chaucer.
Cuddie, . .	..	+	..	..	..	..	..	+	..	+	..	..	
Phyllis, . .	..	x	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Willie, . .	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	Lly.
Thomalin, . .	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	
Piers, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Protestant.
Palinode, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	..	..	..	Catholic.
Menalcas, . .	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Morell, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	Elmore (Aylmer).
Algrend, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	..	..	..	Grindal.
Perigot, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	+	..	..	..	..	
Diggon Davy, . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	+	..	..	..	
Dido, . . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	Elizabeth Dudley.
Lobbin, . . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	..	Robert, Earl of Leicester.
Wrenock, . . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	x	..	

Name of Character.	Interlocutors with that character in the <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> .
Colin, . . . .	Hobbinol, Thenot.
Hobbinol, . . . .	Colin, Thenot, Diggon Davy.
Thenot, . . . .	Colin, Hobbinol, Piers, Cuddie, Perigot.
Diggon Davy, . . . .	Hobbinol.
Piers, . . . .	Thenot, Cuddie, Palinode.
Cuddie, . . . .	Piers, Thenot, Perigot, Willie.
Perigot, . . . .	Cuddie, Willie, Thomalin.
Willie, . . . .	Cuddie, Perigot.
Thomalin, . . . .	Perigot, Morell.
Morell, . . . .	Thomalin.
Palinode, . . . .	Piers.



SUBJECT.	No. of Eclo.	LINE-METRE.		STANZA-METRE.	
		Kind of Foot.	No. of Feet.	No. of Lines.	Rhyme Formula.
Contempt of Poetry, . . . .	10	~—	5	6	abbaba.
Praise of Elizabeth, . . . .	4	{ ~—	5	4	abab,bcbc, etc.
Death of Dido, . . . .	11	{ and complex Stanzas.			
Rosalinde's Cruelty, . . . .	{ 6 12	{ ~— { ~—	5 5	8 6	ababbaba. ababcc.
Shepherd's Contest, . . . .	8	The same, and Ballad, and Sextain.			
Bad Pastors, . . . .	{ 7 9	{ ~— { ~—	4,3,4,3 4	4	abab.
Priest's Deceit, . . . .	5	~—	4	2	aa.
Reverence for Age, . . . .	2				
Thomalin's Love, . . . .	3	~—	4,4,3,4,4,3	6	aabccb.

I have not ventured to put in the table, but yet suggest provisionally, the following additional identifications:

I. PIERS AND PALINODE.—Piers (Percy) I take to be

William Percy, author of *Sonnets to Cælia*. The Percies of Northumberland had recently adopted the Protestant faith. Hence the fitness of William Percy for the discussion in the fifth eclogue.

Palinode was probably Henry Constable, the only Roman Catholic poet of the time at all likely to be introduced into a pastoral. He was B.A. 1579, expatriated, and on his return imprisoned on account of his religion, and not released till 1604.

2. THOMALIN.—The good, unambitious shepherd (pastor, clergyman) I take to be Thomas Preston, Fellow of King's College, afterwards Master of Trinity Hall, author of *Cambyses*. Preston was a friend of Spenser's, as we know from his correspondence with G. Harvey.

3. DIGGON DAVY (DICKON DAVY), I would suggest, was Thomas Churchyard, who wrote *Davy Dickar's Dream*, in 1562. Diggon had driven his sheep, in hope of gain, into a far country, and Churchyard had long 'trailed a pike' abroad.

In reading this poem care must be taken to distinguish the northern dialect, affected in many parts of it, from the old forms adopted by Spenser from Chaucer in his *Fairy Queen* and many of the minor poems. The form of the pastoral is due to the influence that Guarini and Tasso were at that date exercising on the English poets. The eclogues were much admired and praised, notably by Abraham Fraunce, Philip Sidney, Francis Meres, and Michael Drayton. The double meaning of shepherd (sometimes poet, sometimes clergyman) should be noted. The follower of the Good Shepherd takes his name from his employment, just as in Fletcher's *Piscatory Eclogues*, so often misunderstood, the fisher for souls does.

### 8. *Visions of the World's Vanity.*

We now come to a group of poems distinctly written in rivalry of those which Spenser in his earliest time had translated. They may be arranged thus, in parallel columns:

Visions of World's Vanity.  
Ruins of Time.  
Muiopotmos.

Visions of { Petrarch.  
Bellay.  
Ruins of Rome.  
Virgil's Gnat.

The *Visions of the World's Vanity* were published in the *Complaints*, 1591, without dedication. They should be read with careful comparison with the earlier *Visions*. They

are written in the second form of sonnet; date probably *circa* 1589.

9. *Ruins of Time (World's Ruins).*

Written 'since my coming into England,' 1589-90, in memory of Sir Philip Sidney and his noble race, dedicated to Lady Mary, Countess of Pembroke, his sister, and published in the *Complaints*, 1591. Sidney in it is called Phili-sides. The metre is Chaucerian, or rhyme-royal; but in the vision part of it the stanzas are arranged in pairs, the first line of the second taking up the rhyme of the last line of the first, so as to make a sort of bastard sonnet, of formula *ababbcccdccdee*.

10. *Muiopotmos (Death of the Butterfly).*

Published in the *Complaints*, 1591, but dated 1590; dedicated to Lady Carey. Perhaps it allegorises some event of recent occurrence. The metre is *ottava rima*, the same as *Virgil's Gnat*.

11. *Tears of the Muses.*

The last of the poems published in the *Complaints*, 1591; dedicated to Lady Strange. The metre is six-line heroic—that is, six-line stanzas of formula *ababcc*, each line consisting of 5 —. The most important critical point in it is the identification of Willy, most absurdly supposed by some critics to be Shakespeare. There is no doubt that Malone was right in interpreting him as Lylly. No other writer 'for the comic stage' had attained eminence in 1590, and Lylly left off writing in 1589. That 'dead of late' means this, and not actual decease, is clear from the subsequent words:

'Doth rather choose to sit in idle cell;

and in fact these words prove Lylly to be the person meant, beyond dispute. For at the end of Lylly's *Euphues* we are told that 'Euphues is musing in the bottom of the mountain Sili-sedra; and this is applied to the retirement of Lylly from his dramatic work in the title to Greene's *Menaphon*, 1589, 'Camilla's alarm to slumbering Euphues in his melancholy CELL at Silex-edra; and again in the title to Lodge's *Rosalyn*, 1590, 'Euphues' golden legacy found after his DEATH in his CELL at Silex-edra.' Putting these passages together, there can be no doubt of Spenser's meaning, nor of the date of the poem, 1590-1.

12. *Daphnaina.*

Whether this poem should precede or follow *Astrophel* is disputed. In my opinion it comes first. I take the date in the dedication (to Helena, Marquesse of Northampton) to mean 1st January 1591, not 1592, as I think Spenser made January, and not Easter, the beginning of his year (see the argument to the *Shepherd's Calendar*, by E. Kirke). The poem is an elegy on the death of Douglas Howard, daughter of Henry, Lord Howard, wife of Arthur Gorges (Alcyon). The metre is a modification of the Chaucerian stanza, with rhyme formula *ababcbc*.

13. *Astrophel.*

Published in 1595, along with other elegies on the death of Sir Philip Sidney, by Mary of Pembroke, Ludowick Bryskett, Matthew Roydon, and others. Probably written in 1591, just after Spenser's return to Ireland—certainly after the *Ruins of Time* (see the dedication to that poem). *Astrophel* means lover of the Star, Stella (Lady Rich). The poem is dedicated to the Countess of Essex. The metre is the same as that of the *Tears of the Muses*. Mary Sidney is in this pastoral elegy called Clorinda; but this name seems to be of her own selection, not Spenser's.

14. *Colin Clout's Come Home Again.*

Published in 1595, but dated in dedication (to Sir W. Raleigh) 27th December 1591. This has been most gratuitously assumed to be a misprint. At the same time we must admit that in this and the other instances of Spenser's publishing poems some years after they were written he touched them up, and added to them at the time of publication (see, for instance, the final sonnet in the *Visions of Petrarch*, noticed above). The metre is elegiac—that is, four-line stanzas, of formula *abab*, each line being 5—. The chief critical question connected with this interesting poem is the identification of the poets adumbrated under pastoral names. I give therefore, as in the case of the *Shepherd's Calendar*, tables that will aid in this investigation, followed by a *résumé* of the arguments of Todd, Malone, and myself, to which I subjoin, as being a convenient place for it, a brief notice of the ladies alluded to in Spenser's dedications, etc.:

Name of Character.	Person Designated.	Poems Dedicated to them.	Poems in which the Name recurs.
Colin Clout,	Edmund Spenser, . . . . .	.....	Shepherd's Calendar.
Hobbinol,	Gabriel Harvey, . . . . .	.....	Shepherd's Calendar.
Tityrus, .	Geoffrey Chaucer, . . . . .	.....	Shepherd's Calendar.
Cuddie, .	Robert, Earl of Leicester, . . . . .	.....	Shepherd's Calendar.
Lobbins,	Philip Sidney, . . . . .	.....	Shepherd's Calendar.
Astrophel,	Ludovick Brisket, . . . . .	.....	Astrophel.
Lycon, Thestyliis,		.....	.....
Corylas, .		.....	.....
Alexis, .		.....	.....
Harpalus,	Thomas Churchyard (M.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Corydon,	Barnaby Googe (T.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Alcyon, .	Abraham Fraunce (M., T., etc.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Palin, .	Edward Dyer (Fleay), . . . . .	.....	.....
Alcon, .	Arthur Gorges, . . . . .	.....	Daphnida.
Palemon,	George Peele (M.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Alabaster,	Thomas Chaloner (T.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Daniel, .	Thomas Lodge (M.), . . . . .	.....	.....
Ocean Shepherd,	Thomas Watson (T.), . . . . .	.....	.....
	Arthur Golding (M.), . . . . .	.....	.....
	Thomas Churchyard (T.), . . . . .	.....	.....
	William Alabaster, . . . . .	.....	.....
	Samuel Daniel, . . . . .	.....	.....
	Walter Raleigh, . . . . .	.....	.....
	Colin Clout, . . . . .	.....	.....

Amyntas,	.	Ferdinand, Earl of Derby,	.	.	.	.	.
Action,	.	{ Michael Drayton (T.),	.	{	.	.	.
		William Shakespeare (M.),	.		.	.	.
		Sir Robert Needham,	.		.	.	.
		<i>(Ladies.)</i>					
Marin,	.						
Lucida,	.						
Melissa,	.						
Aglaura,	.						
Urania,	.	Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke,*	.	Ruins of Time,	.		
Theana,	.	Anne, Countess of Warwick,	.	Four Hymns,	.		
Marian,	.	Margaret, Countess of Cumberland,	.	Daphnaida,	.		
Mansilia,	.	Helena, Marquesse of Northampton,	.				
Daphnaida,	.	{ Douglas Gorges, L. H. Howard's	.				
		daughter,†	.				
Galathaea,	.						
Neara,	.	L. Penelope Rich,	.				
Stella,	.	L. Elizabeth Carey,‡	.				
Phyllis,	.	L. Anne Compton and Mounteagle,‡	.				
Charyllis,	.	L. Alice Strange,‡	.				
Amaryllis,	.						
Flavia,	.						
Candida,	.	Countess of Essex,	.	Astrophel,	.		

\* Called Clorinda in *Astrophel*.  
† Née Spenser, daughters of Sir John Spenser of Althorpe.

† Called White Lioness in *Daphnaida*.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE POETS MENTIONED IN 'COLIN CLOUT'S COME HOME AGAIN,' CHIEFLY FROM MALONE.

1. HARPALUS.—Thomas Churchyard, then seventy years old, was author of many of the miscellaneous verses appended to Surrey's *Poems*. Among these is one called *Harpalus' Complaint*. He had been long in the queen's service, and was pensioned by her.—*Malone*.

Barnaby Googe was a pensioner of the queen, and was aged.—*Todd*.

2. CORYDON.—Abraham Fraunce was author of the *Lamentation of Corydon for the Love of Alexis*.—*Malone*.

3. ALCYON.—Arthur Gorges. The name is formed from that of Alcyone, the faithful wife of Ceyx. See Chaucer; also Spenser's *Daphnaida*.

4. PALIN.—An abbreviation of Palinode, one of the interlocutors in George Peele's *Eulogy on Essex*. Peele had introduced Spenser in his *Arraignment of Paris* as dead for love, and Hobbinol, Diggon, and Thenot as singing a dirge over him.—*Malone*.

Thomas Chaloner is ranked with Spenser by Puttenham, and highly by Meres, for pastoral poetry.—*Todd*.

5. ALCON.—The name of a character in the *Looking-glass for London*, by Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene. Lodge had written many short love-poems. He had written verses in praise of Spenser, and he did take his advice in producing 'matter of more skill afterwards.'—*Malone*.

Thomas Watson had written many madrigals, etc.—*Todd*.

6. PALEMON.—Arthur Golding translated Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In book iv is the story of the change of Melicerta into the sea-god Palemon. Golding was sixty years old, a very voluminous writer and translator; moral, and heavy, and ill-paid.—*Malone*.

Thomas Churchyard was a laborious writer, who died poor.—*Todd*.

In Churchyard's *Cherishing*, 1596, he says the court is

‘ The platform where all poets thrive,  
Save one, whose voice is hoarse, they say.’

This seems decisive.—*Boswell*.

7. WILLIAM ALABASTER.

8. SAMUEL DANIEL.

9. SHEPHERD OF THE OCEAN.—Sir Walter Raleigh.

10. AMYNTAS—Ferdinand, Earl of Derby.

II. AETION.—The following is mostly taken from a letter of mine to the *Athenaeum*:

‘To the subjoined letter on Aetion I have only to add that Marcus Antoninus uses *al’rior* in the sense in which the Elizabethans used *lōēta*—namely, that of “form without matter; exemplar.”

### ‘IS AETION SHAKESPEARE?’

‘The passage in Spenser’s *Colin Clout’s Come Home Again*—

“And there though last not least is Aetion ;  
A gentler shepherd may nowhere be found :  
Whose Muse full of high thought’s invention  
Doth like himself heroically sound,”

was supposed to allude to Shakespeare by Malone, on the grounds—(1) That Shakespeare was called *gentle*; (2) That his muse was full of high thought’s invention; (3) That the name Shake-spear sounds heroically. Mr Hales has added a fourth argument: “The name was adopted for its own intrinsic significance, as Spenser interpreted it. He has in his mind the Greek *ἀετός*; and, seeing in the rising Shakespeare a poet whose imagination was to soar aloft, he styled him *The Eaglet*.” To this another argument may be added: the falcon in Shakespeare’s arms might be alluded to as the eaglet, for eagles were ranked as a species of the genus falcon or hawk in Shakespeare’s time. Thus in the translation of Pomey’s *Universe in Epitome*, by A. Lovell, we find eagle, falcon, and marlin grouped together under the head of Birds for Hawking; and in Ryder’s *Latin Dictionary*, eagle, falcon, and merlin expressly called hawks; and under *Falco*, hawk and falcon are given as synonymous. On the other hand, Todd, and after him Mr Minto, have asserted that Aetion is Drayton. In support of his claim it has been urged that Drayton’s assumed poetical name, *Rowland*, sounds more heroically than Shakespeare; and that Lodge, in 1596, a year after *Colin Clout* was published, mentions Drayton, but not Shakespeare, which would be strange if Spenser had already mentioned Shakespeare but not Drayton. To this I add, that in Drayton’s *Sonnets*, published in 1594, he calls one *An Allusion to the Eaglet*. It begins :

“When like an *eaglet* I first found my love.”

As these pastoral names were often taken from the *writings* of the poet alluded to, Aetion may easily have originated from this sonnet. Again, there is no reason why in 1595 Drayton should not have written and circulated in MS. one or more of *England’s Heroicall Epistles*, published in 1598, which would account for “his heroically sounding muse.” But all this depends on the assumption that *Colin Clout* was written in 1594-5. If, as Professor Morley thinks (and I agree with him), the main part of it was written in 1591, and this verse was part of that early portion, then we have a third claimant,

Marlow; for his name was written *Marlen* or *Marlin* oftener than *Marlow*. He is called *Marlin* in Beard's *Theatre of God's Judgments*, 1597; he was entered at college under this same name in 1580; he took his degree as *Marlyn* in 1583; and is mentioned as *Marlyn* as late as Latham's *Falconry*, 1618. By the way, the mention of this book reminds me that Lady Juliana Berners expressly calls the eagle a kind of hawk. Now that *Marlyn* and *Eaglet* were considered as synonymous, there is proof in an allusion in Petow's *Hero and Leander* (a continuation of Marlow's). He says of Marlow:

“Oh had that king of poets breathed longer,  
Then had fair beauty's forts been much more stronger;  
His golden pen had closed her so about  
No *bastard eaglet's* quill the world throughout  
Had been of force to mar what he had made.”

Here Marlyn the true eaglet is distinctly contrasted with the false one; so that whether Aetion is Marlow or not, Marlin is certainly an eaglet. That he was a “gentle shepherd” is shown in the quotation by Dyce from the *New Metamorphosis*, by J. M., 1660, where he is called “kind Kit Marlow.” That Marlin, recalling the great Arthurian enchanter, “sounds heroically” is clear enough, and we know how his verse was estimated as far as his plays are concerned by the allusions to his “sounding lines.” It may be said that Spenser must have cut out this notice on publishing in 1595, because Marlow was dead: but we do not always do all we ought; and Spenser may have remembered to alter his verses on Ferdinand, Lord Derby, the poet's patron, and forgotten to do so for the humbler Marlow. I have, I think, fairly stated above the views that can be held on Mr Hales's hypothesis, that Aetion means *eaglet*, and shown that it does not follow that Aetion must mean Shakespeare. I am bound now to give my own view. I believe that Aetion is not derived from *ætēos*, but from *aītios*, as Malone suggested in a note. For the line—


“And there, though last, not least is Aetion,”

requires us to read *Ætion*\* in three syllables, and not *Aëtion* in four. I know some scansionists may deny this; but no poet will. And again, who has ever seen the word *Aëtion* anywhere else in English literature? Is the obscure Greek painter mentioned in English except in classical dictionaries? Or has any author used it for “eaglet?” *Ætion*, on the other hand, was so common a word in Elizabethan Latin, that it is given in the Latin dictionaries for schoolboys. In Ryder's *Dictionary* I find “*Ætion aītiov et ætia actiorum, causa principium et origo—an originall, beginning, or cause.*” It is much more likely, then, that Malone's derivation is right, than that the ingenious conjecture made by Mr Hales is. But what can

\* Mr Hales says that Spenser's system does not admit of Ae (thus printed) being sounded *Æ*. I open the Globe edition at random, and find *Aegoria*, book ii, canto x, stanza 42.

Ætion mean as a poet's name? Is any work of Shakespeare or Drayton called *æτιον*? I think there is. Drayton's pastoral name for his mistress is Idea, *ldea*; *Idea est eorum quæ natura fiunt exemplar æternum*. So Drayton calls his mistress the example or pattern from whom all other women derive their excellence by participating in hers. As Cooper's *Thesaurus* has it, under Idea, "Pattern of all other sort or kind, as of one seal proceedeth many prints." But Drayton was not content with a mere allusion. Of the three works he had published before 1595, one was called *Idea*, and another *Idea's Mirrour*. What, then, more natural than to indicate Drayton by Ætion, the synonym for Idea? I conclude that the interpretation of Todd and the derivation of Malone are the correct ones, and that the only point they did not see was that Ætion meant "The original, the exemplar, the first, though here the last mentioned; the *formal cause*." So Giles Fletcher uses *Idea in Christ's Victory and Triumph*, st. xxxix:

"In midst of this city celestial,  
Where the eternal temple should have rose,  
Light'ned th' *Idea beatifical*,  
End and *beginning of each thing that grows*."



"Carew uses the word "cause" just in the same way :

"Ask me no more where Jove bestows,  
When June is past, the fading rose,  
For in your beauty's orient deep  
These flowers, *as in their causes*, sleep."

And so Drummond (sonnet 9) :

"Elsewhere saw th' *Idea* of that face."

And Glapthorne (vol. ii, p. 36) :

"Th' *Idea* of all perfection."

The word Idea in this sense was becoming fashionable in 1590 as is clear from several passages in Lodge's *Rosalyn*.

'If any one objects to my supposition that the *Heroicall Epistles* were in circulation as early as 1595, I would refer him to Drayton's *Address to the Reader*—“Seeing these Epistles are *now* to the world made public,” etc., which distinctly implies that they had been written, and were known to have been written for some time; and again, in the *Catalogue of the Heroical Loves*, he says :

"Their several loves since I before have shown,  
Now give me leave at last to sing my own."

This implies that the *Heroicall Epistles* were written before his love-poems to Idea, for in no other poems does he “sing his own loves.” But *Idea* and *Idea's Mirrour* were published in 1593 and 1594.'

## ON SOME OF THE LADIES ALLUDED TO IN 'SPENSER.'

Sir John Spenser of Althorpe, in Northamptonshire, had five sons and six daughters. Three of the latter are mentioned by Spenser, namely :

1. ELIZABETH, the second daughter, married Sir George Carey (Carew), who became Lord Hunsdon at his father's death, 1596.

2. ANNE, the fifth daughter, married (a.) Sir William Stanley, Lord Mounteagle; (b.) Henry, Lord Compton, who died 1589; (c.) Robert Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, afterwards Earl of Dorset.

3. ALICE, the sixth daughter, who married (a.) Ferdinando, Lord Strange, who became Earl of Derby at his father's death in 1593. He died 16th April 1594, leaving three daughters. (b.) Sir Thomas Egerton, afterwards Baron of Ellesmere and Viscount Brackley.

Henry, Lord Howard, Viscount Byndon, had a daughter, Douglas Howard, who married Arthur Gorges, afterwards knighted. The Lady Helena, Marchioness of Northampton, was aunt to Douglas.

Francis, Earl of Bedford, had daughters :

1. ANNE, who married the Earl of Warwick. She was his third wife. He died February 1589-90. She did not marry again.

2. MARGARET, who married the Earl of Cumberland.

Sir Francis Walsingham had a daughter, Francis, who married (a.) Sir Philip Sidney, (b.) the Earl of Essex, (c.) Richard de Burgh, the great Earl of Clanricarde.

Sir Henry Sidney had children :

1. SIR PHILIP SIDNEY.

2. MARY, who married the Earl of Pembroke.

### 15. *Amoretti und Epithalamion.*

Published in 1595. 'Written not long since,' that is, in 1592-4. Dedicated by the publisher to Sir Robert Needham, who brought it over (probably with the other poems published in the same year) from Ireland. The sonnets are all written in the second sonnet metre of Spenser, and contain the story of his wooing Elizabeth, 'the country lass' in Ireland, after he had given up all thought of his first love, Rosalinde, 'the widow's daughter of the glen.' The *Epithalamion* was written upon his own marriage. The metre is one of complex long stanzas of varying number of lines, and varying rhyme

formulas, the last two lines of each stanza forming a refrain. Lines 6, 11, are 3—; 16, 17, are 4—; the rest are 5—. The whole is closed by an *envoy*; one stanza a third modification of the Chaucerian: formula, *ababacc*. Between the sonnets and *Epithalamion* are placed four epigrams of uncertain date, mere trifles.

### 16. *Four Hymns.*

Published, and no doubt written, in 1596. The dedication to Lady Margaret of Cumberland and Lady Mary of Warwick is dated Greenwich, 1st September 1596. The first two hymns have already been noticed. The last two are written in the same metre (Chaucerian), so as to correspond with the first. These heavenly hymns are as inferior to the earthly as continuations usually are.

### 17. *Prothalamion.*

Published and written in 1596, in honour of the marriages of Elizabeth and Katherine, daughters of the Earl of Somerset: a fine poem, but not comparable to the unequalled *Epithalamion*. The stanza is of formula *abbaa* {*b*} {*b*} {*c*} {*c*} - *ddeeffgg*; lines 5, 10, 15, 16, being 3—, the rest 5—. The last two lines in each stanza form a refrain.

### 18. *Fairy Queen.*

Books i-iii were published in 1590. We learn from Harvey's letters that Spenser began this poem as early as 1580. He probably spent most of his leisure time on it from 1579 to 1589. In these ten years he wrote three books, and no doubt planned and wrote portions of the rest. It was published with verses to the author prefixed, by W. Raleigh (W. R., Ignoto), G. Harvey (Hobynoll), R. Stanyhurst (?) (R. S.), and others; also with a series of sonnets to various noblemen, etc., a list of whom is given below. The metre is Spenserian, the rhyme formula being *ababbcbcc*. The last line is an Alexandrine, with or without caesura, 6—; the other lines are 5—. In 1596 books iv-vi were published. These were written from 1590 to 1595, in about half the time of the first three; but Spenser had then resigned his clerkships, and had more leisure. Moreover, these latter books are far inferior to the earlier ones. There is no more of the

original design completed, except cantos 6, 7, of book vii. There were to have been twelve books. It forms no part of my plan to discuss the nature of the allegory of this poem. In spite of the many beauties in special passages, I believe that, aesthetically, this, like all lengthy allegories, is a failure, and that it is in virtue of its many excellences in detail, and in spite of its general plan, that it survives. I may point out, however, that it is mostly in the earlier books that the ~~personages are abstract~~ qualities, and in the later books that they veil historical individualities. I subjoin a list of a few that can be tolerably well identified, merely as examples, not as in any way complete:

## ALLEGORICAL PERSONAGES.

<i>St George,</i>	.	.	.	Holiness.
<i>Sansfoy,</i>	.	.	.	Unbelief.
<i>Una,</i>	.	.	.	Truth (English Church).
<i>Archimago,</i>	.	.	.	Hypocrisy.
<i>Duessa,</i>	.	.	.	Deceit (Romish Church).
<i>Orgoglio,</i>	.	.	.	Pride.
<i>Abissa,</i>	.	.	.	Ignorance.
<i>Corecca,</i>	.	.	.	Superstition.
<i>Guyon,</i>	.	.	.	Temperance.
<i>Mordant,</i>	.	.	.	{ Excess in drink.
<i>Amasia,</i>	.	.	.	Enough.
<i>Medina,</i>	.	.	.	Too much.
<i>Perissa,</i>	.	.	.	Too little.
<i>Elissa,</i>	.	.	.	Fiery passion.
<i>Pyrochles,</i>	.	.	.	Impetuous passion.
<i>Cymochles,</i>	.	.	.	Chastity.
<i>Britomart,</i>	.	.	.	Incontinence.
<i>Malecasta,</i>	.	.	.	Immodest mirth.
<i>Phædria,</i>	.	.	.	Jealousy.
<i>Malbecco,</i>	.	.	.	Slander.
<i>Blatant Beast,</i>	.	.	.	Discourtesy.
<i>Crudor,</i>	.	.	.	Etc.
Etc.				Etc.

## HISTORICAL PERSONAGES.

<i>Gloriana,</i>	.	.	.	Elizabeth as queen.
<i>Belphœbe,</i>	.	.	.	Elizabeth as woman.
<i>Braggadocio,</i>	.	.	.	Duke of Anjou.
<i>Timias,</i>	.	.	.	Sir W. Raleigh.
<i>Marinel,</i>	.	.	.	Howard.
<i>Blandamour,</i>	.	.	.	Northumberland.
<i>Artegal,</i>	.	.	.	Arthur, Lord Grey.
<i>Bourbon,</i>	.	.	.	Henry IV.

<i>Fleur de lis</i> , . . . .	France.
<i>Belge</i> , . . . .	Netherlands.
<i>Geryoneo</i> , . . . .	Spain.
<i>Geryoneo's Seneschal</i> ,	Duke of Alva.
<i>Ierna</i> , . . . .	Ireland.
<i>Gergis</i> , . . . .	Walsingham.
<i>Arthur</i> , . . . .	Leicester (?).
<i>Pollente</i> ,	Charles IX.
<i>Guizor</i> , . . . .	Duke of Guise.
<i>Calidor</i> ,	Sir P. Sidney.
<i>Paridel</i> ,	Westmoreland.
<i>Palmer</i> ,	Dr Whitgift.
<i>Babe with bloody hand</i> ,	O'Neil.
<i>Satypane</i> , . . . .	Sir John Perrot.
<i>Amoretta</i> , . . . .	{ Elizabeth Throckmorton.
<i>Serena</i> , . . . .	{ Mary, Queen of Scots.
<i>Florimel</i> , . . . .	
<i>Busirane</i> , . . . .	L. Burleigh.
<i>Trompart</i> , . . . .	Simier.
<i>Belgarde</i> , . . . .	Belvoir Castle.
<i>Mercilla</i> , . . . .	Q. Elizabeth.
Etc.	Etc.

The sonnets prefixed to the *Fairy Queen* are addressed to :

1. Sir Christopher Hatton, Lord High Chancellor.
2. Lord Burleigh, Lord High Treasurer.
3. Earl of Oxenford, Lord High Chamberlain.
4. Earl of Northumberland.
5. Earl of Cumberland.
6. Earl of Essex, Great Master of the Horse.
7. Earl of Ormond and Ossory.
8. Lord Charles Howard, Lord High Admiral.
9. Lord of Hunsdon, High Chamberlain.
10. Lord Grey of Wilton.
11. Lord of Buckhurst, of the Privy Council.
12. Sir Francis Walsingham, Principal Secretary to her Majesty.
13. Sir John Norris, Lord President of Mounster.
14. Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Warden of the Stanneryes, and Lieutenant of Cornwall.
15. Countess of Pembroke.
16. Lady Carew.
17. Ladies in the Court.

## CHAPTER III.

### ON POETS CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH SPENSER AND SHAKESPEARE.

IT is extremely desirable for the student that he should be able to refer to some tolerably complete catalogue of the poetical literature during the Elizabethan age. At present the only one known to me at all suiting his purpose is that contained in Nathan Drake's *Shakespeare and his Times* (2 vols. quarto), an expensive work difficult of access, and containing, with some very valuable matters, much that has been superseded. At the suggestion of Mr Samuel Neil of Edinburgh (a Shakespearian critic and editor, who has, by his *Life of Shakespeare*, and issues of his plays, done great service to the investigation of critical questions connected with seventeenth-century literature) this chapter is inserted. It is based on Drake's book, with such additions and corrections as I am able to give for the lesser poets, of whose works merely a catalogue is given. Of the greater ones who are worth study in their entirety, and are (thanks to Mr Grosart's and other reprints) accessible to students, I give here merely a list, hoping hereafter to publish a full account of them containing a large amount of new facts and critical conclusions, gathered in some years of study of the finest, although too often neglected, literary epoch in the world's history.

I begin, then, with the catalogue of the minor men, A.D. 1565-1616, among whom (with the exception of Fulke Greville (Lord Brooke), Richard Barnefield, Barnaby Googe, Alexander Montgomery, and Abraham Fraunce) I know of none worth study for their intrinsic merit. They are, however, valuable for the light they often shed on their greater contemporaries in minor points. Names with an \* are not given by Drake. A few names, for reasons not worth dwelling on, but sufficiently manifest, are repeated from this table in pp. 108, 109.

## GUIDE TO SPENSER.

101

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Acheley, Thomas,	Novel from Bandello, .	1576
Alabaster, William,*	{ On the Saviour (Malone, Shakespeare, vol. ii), . . .	{ c. 1590
Alexander, William, Earl of Stirling,*	{ Aurora, . . . . .	1604
Anderson, James,	Second Coming of Christ, .	1595
Andrewe, Thomas,	Feminine Machiavel, .	1604
Annerson, James,	Carolana, . . . . .	1614
Arthington, Henry,	Holy Profession, . . . . .	1607
Aske, James, .	{ Elizabetha Triumphans (blank verse), . . . . .	{ 1588
Avale, Lemeke, .	Dirge of Edmund Boner, .	1569
Balnevis, Henry,	Confession of Faith, .	1584
Barclay, Jo., *	Poematum, Libri duo,	1615
Barnefield, Richard,	Cynthia; Sonnets; Cassandra, .	1594
"	Affectionate Shepherd, .	1595
"	Lady Pecunia, . . . . .	1598
Barnes, Barnaby,	Parthenophil and Parthenope, .	1593
Bastard, Thomas,	Spiritual Sonnets, . . . . .	1595
Batman, Stephen,	Chrestoleros (epigrams), .	1595
Beverley, Peter, .	Travelled Pilgrim, . . . . .	1569
Bieston, Roger, .	Ariodante and Genevra (Ariosto), .	1600
Blenner Hasset, Thomas,	Bait and Snare of Fortune, .	n. d.
Bourcher, Arthur,	Mirror for Magistrates, part 2, .	1578
Bourman, Nicholas,	Fable of <i>Æsop</i> , . . . . .	1566
Bradshaw, Thomas,	Friendly Well-wishing, . . . . .	1581
Brice, Thomas, .	Shepherd's Star, . . . . .	1591
Broughton, Rowland,	Court of Venus; Songs; Sonnets, .	1567
Brooke, Thomas,	Sir W. Pawlett, . . . . .	1572
Bryskett, Ludowick,	Certain verses in prison, . . . . .	1570
Buc, Sir George,	Mourning Muses on Sir P. Sidney, .	1587
Campion, Thomas,*	Daphnis Polystefanos, . . . . .	1605
Carew, Richard,	Masques ( <i>see</i> Nicholl's Progresses).	
Carpenter, John,	Godfrey of Bulloigne (Tasso, i-v), .	1594
Chaloner, Sir Thomas,*	Sorrowful Song, . . . . .	1586
Chester, Robert,	Poemata, . . . . .	1579
Chettle, Henry, .	{ Love's Martyr, or Rosalin's Complaint (from Torquato Cæliano); King Arthur, . . . . .	{ 1601
" .	{ Pope's Lamentation for Don John of Austria, . . . . .	{ 1578
" .	Forest of Fancy, . . . . .	1579
" .	Doleful Ditty of Lord Darnley, .	1579
Chute, Anthony,	Shore's Wife, . . . . .	1593
Clapham, Henoch,	Procris and Cephalus, . . . . .	1593
	Bible History, . . . . .	1596

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Copley, Anthony,	Love's Owl, . . . . .	1595
"	Fig for Fortunie, . . . . .	1596
Cottesford, Thomas,	Prayer to Daniel, . . . . .	1570
Cotton, Roger, .	Armor of Proof, . . . . .	1596
"	Spiritual Song, . . . . .	1596
Culrose, Elizabeth,	Ane Godly Dream, . . . . .	1603
Cutwode, T., .	Caltha Poetarum (Bumble Bee), . . . . .	1599
Davidstone, John,	Commendation of Uprightness, . . . . .	1573
Davies, John, .	Two Worthy Christians, . . . . .	1595
"	Mirum in Modum, . . . . .	1602
"	Microcosmos, . . . . .	1603
"	Humours Heaven on Earth, . . . . .	1605
"	Scourge of Folly, . . . . .	1611
"	Muse's Sacrifice, . . . . .	1612
"	{ Select Second Husband for Sir T. Overbury's Wife, . . . . .	1616
Davison, Francis and	Wit's Pilgrimage, . . . . .	16—
Walter, .	{ Sonnets; Odes; Elegies; Madrigals; Epigrams, . . . . .	1602
Delone, Thomas,	Strange Histories, . . . . .	1612
Derricke, John, .	Image of Ireland, . . . . .	1581
Dowrick, Ann, .	French History, . . . . .	1589
Drant, Thomas, .	Medicinable Moral (Horace's Satires), . . . . .	1566
"	Horace's Art of Poetry, . . . . .	1567
"	Greg. Nazianzen (epigrams, etc.), . . . . .	1568
Edwardes, C., .	Mansion of Mirth, . . . . .	1581
Elderton, William,	Elderton's Solace, . . . . .	1598
Elviden, Edmond,	Ballads, . . . . .	1590
"	Closest of Counsels (translation), . . . . .	1569
Evans, Lewes, .	Pisistratus and Catanea, . . . . .	n. d.
Evans, William, .	Horace, Satires i, ii, . . . . .	1564
Fenner, Dudley, .	Thamesiades (Chastity's Triumph), . . . . .	1602
Fennor, William, .	Song of Songs, . . . . .	1587
Ferrers, George, .	Fennor's Description, . . . . .	1616
Fetherstone, Christopher,	Mirror for Magistrates (part), . . . . .	1578
Fleming, Abraham,	Lamentations of Jeremiah, . . . . .	1587
Fletcher, Robert,	Virgil's Bucolics, . . . . .	1575
Fraunce, Abraham,	Virgil's Georgics (Rurals), . . . . .	1589
"	Epitaph on Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	1603
"	{ Lamentations of Amintas for Phillis (translation), . . . . .	1588
"	Arcadian Rhetorick, . . . . .	1588
"	Countess of Pembroke's Emanuel, . . . . .	1591
"	{ Ivy Church (Phillis, " and Amyntas, from Tasso), . . . . .	1591


Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Fraunce, Abraham,	{ Countess of Pembroke's Ivy Church part 3, Amintas Dale, . . .	{ 1592
Freeman, Thomas,	Heliodorus's Ethiopics, . . .	1591
Fulwel, Ulpian,	Rub and a Great Cast, . . .	1614
Gale, Dunstan,	Flower of Fame (Henry VIII), .	1575
Gamage, William,	Pyramus and Thisbe, . . .	1597
Garter, Barnard,	Linsie Woolsie (epigrams), . .	1613
Gifford, Humfrey,	Two English Lovers, . . .	1565
Golding, Arthur,	Posy of Gillyflowers, . . .	1580
	Ovid's Metamorphoses, . . .	1567
Googe, Barnaby,	{ Zodiac of Life (translation from Marcellus Pallingenius Stel- latus), . . .	{ 1565
" .	{ Popish Kingdom (from Thomas Naogeorgus), . . .	{ 1570
" .	{ Overthrow of Gowt (from Chr. Balista), . . .	{ 1577
Gordon, Patrick,	History of Bruce, . . .	1615
Gorges, Sir Arthur,	{ Olympian Catastrophe (on Prince Henry), . . .	{ 1612
Gosson, Stephen,	Lucan's Pharsalia, . . .	1614
Grange, John,	Speculum Humanum, . . .	1580
Greene, Thomas,	His Garden, . . .	1577
Greepe, Thomas,	Poet's Vision and Prince's Glory, .	1603
	On Sir Francis Drake, . . .	1587
Greville, Sir Fulke,	{ Cœlica; Human Learning; Fame and Honour; Wars; Remains; .	{ 1600
	Poems in England's Helicon, .	1620
Griffin, B.,	Fidessa (sonnets), . . .	1596
Griffith, William,	Epitaph on Sir H. Sidney, . . .	1591
Grove, Matthew,	Pelops and Hippodamia, etc., etc.,	1587
Grimeston, Elizabeth,	Miscellanea; Memoratives, . . .	1604
Hake, Edward,	Commemoration of Elizabeth, . . .	1575
" .	Touchstone for the Time, . . .	1574
" .	Gold's Kingdom, . . .	1604
Hall, Arthur, .	{ Homer's Iliads, i-x (from French of Hugues Salel), . . .	{ 1581
Hall, John,	Court of Virtue, . . .	1565
Harbert, Sir William,	Baripenthes (Sir Philip Sidney), .	1586
Harbert, William,	Prophecy of Cadwallader, . . .	1604
Harvey, Gabriel,	Four Letters and Sonnets, . . .	1592
Hawes, Edward,	Percy's and Catesby's Prosopopeia,	1606
Heath, John, .	Epigrams, . . .	1610
Herbert, Mary, .	{ Dialogue between Two Shepherds in Praise of Astrea, . . .	{ 1602
Heywood, Jasper,	Poems and Devises, . . .	1576

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Heywood, Thomas,	Troia Britannica, . . . . .	1609
Higgins, John, .	Mirror for Magistrates, part I, . . . . .	1575
Holland, Robert,	History of our Lord, . . . . .	1594
Howell, Thomas,	Arbor of Amitie, . . . . .	1568
Hubbard, " William,	Howell's Devises, . . . . .	1581
Hudson, Thomas,	Ceyx and Alcione, . . . . .	1569
Hume, Alexander,	Judith (from Du Bartas), . . . . .	1584
Hunnis, William,	Hymns, . . . . .	1599
"	Hive Full of Honey (Genesis), . . . . .	1578
Jackson, Richard,	Handfull of Honeysuckles, . . . . .	1578
Jeney, Thomas, .	Seven Sobs, etc., . . . . .	1585
Jenynges, Edward,	Battle of Flodden, . . . . .	1564
Johnson, Richard,	Troubles in France (from Ronsard), . . . . .	1568
"	Alfagus and Archelaus (Friendship), . . . . .	1574
Kelly, Edmund, .	Nine Worthies of London, . . . . .	1592
Kempe, William,	Anglorum Lachrymæ (on Elizabeth), . . . . .	1603
Kendall, Timothy,	On Alchemy, etc., . . . . .	1591
Knell, Thomas, .	{ Invective against Ballard and Babington, . . . . . } 1587	
Kyffin, Maurice,	Epigrams and Trifles, . . . . .	1577
Leighton, Sir William,	Epitaph on Bonner, . . . . .	1569
Lever, Christopher,	Answer to Papistical Bill, etc., . . . . .	1570
Linche, Richard,	Blessedness of Britain, . . . . .	1587
Lisle, William, .	Tears or Lamentations, etc., . . . . .	1613
Lloyd, Lodowick,	Queen Elizabeth's Tears, . . . . .	1607
"	Fountain of Ancient Fiction, . . . . .	1599
Lok, Henry, .	Babylon (from Du Bartas), . . . . .	1596
Lovell, Thomas,	Colonies of Bartas (notes by S. G. S.), . . . . .	1597
Marbeck, John, .	Pilgrimage of Queens, . . . . .	1573
Markham, Gervase,	Hilaria (for 5th Aug.), . . . . .	1607
"	Ecclesiastes; Christian Passions, . . . . .	1597
"	Custom and Verity (on dancing, etc.), . . . . .	1581
"	King David, . . . . .	1579
"	Song of King Solomon, . . . . .	1595
"	Tragedy of Sir Richard Grenvill, . . . . .	1595
"	{ Virtue's Tears for Henri III and Walter Devoreux (from Mdme. G. P. Maulette), . . . . . } 1597	
"	{ Tears of the Beloved (St John on Christ's Death), . . . . . } 1600	
"	Mary Magdalen's Lamentations, . . . . .	1601
"	Ariosto's Satires, . . . . .	1608
"	{ Noble Curtizan (Paulina, Mrs. to Card. Hypolito of Est), . . . . . } 1609	
Maxwell, James,	On Life and Death of Prince Henry, . . . . .	1612
Middleton, Christopher,	History of Heaven (on Stars), . . . . .	1596

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Middleton, Christopher,	{ Legend of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, . . . . }	1600
Middleton, Thomas, .	Wisdom of Solomon, . . . .	1597
Montgomery, Alexander,	The Cherry and the Slae, . . . .	1595
Muncaster, Richard, .	Noenia Consolans, . . . .	1603
Munday, Anthony,	. { Mirror of Mutability (from Scriptures), . . . . }	1579
"	. Pain of Pleasure, . . . .	1580
"	. Fountain of Fame, . . . .	1580
"	. { Sweet Sobs and Amorous Complaints, . . . . }	1583
"	. Munday's Strangest Adventure, . . . .	1601
Murray, David, .	. { Death of Sophonisba; Cœlia (Sonnets), . . . . }	1611
Newton, Thomas,	. Atropoion Delion (Death of Delia), . . . .	1603
"	. Pleasant New History (Rosa, Rosalynde, and Rosemary), . . . .	1604
Nicholson, Samuel,	. Acolastus his Afterwit, . . . .	1600
Nixon, Antony, .	. Christian Navy, . . . .	1602
Norden, John, .	. Storehouse of Varieties, . . . .	1601
" .	. Pensive Soul's Delight, . . . .	1603
" .	. Labyrinth of Man's Life, . . . .	1614
Overbury, Sir Thomas,	{ A Wife: now the Widow of Sir T. O. (Choice of a Wife), . . . . }	1614
Parkes, William,	. Curtain Drawer of the World, . . . .	1612
Parrot, Henry, .	. Mouse-trap (Epigrams), . . . .	1606
" .	. More the Merrier (Epigrams), . . . .	1608
" .	. Epigrams, . . . .	1608
" .	. { Laquei Ridiculosi (Springes for Woodcocks), . . . . }	1613
Partridge, John, .	. Lady Pandavola, . . . .	1566
" .	. Knight Plasidas, . . . .	1566
" .	. Astianax and Polixona, . . . .	1566
Payne, Christopher,	. Christmas Carols, . . . .	1569
Peacham, Henry,	. Minerva Britannia, . . . .	1612
Peele, George, .	. { Farewell to Norris and Drake (with Tale of Troy), . . . . }	1589
" .	. Polyhymnia, . . . .	1590
" .	. Honour of the Garter, . . . .	1593
Peend, Thomas de la,	. Hermaphroditus and Salmacis, . . . .	1565
" .	. John Lord Mandozze (from Spanish), . . . .	1565
Percy, William, .	. Sonnets to Cœlia, . . . .	1594
Petowe, Henry, .	. Hero and Leander, part 2, . . . .	1598
" .	. Philochasander and Elanira, . . . .	1599
" .	. Elizabetha quasi Vivans [sic], . . . .	1603
" .	. Whipping of Runaways, . . . .	1603

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Pett, Peter, .	Time's Journey to Seek Truth, etc.,	1599
Phillip, John, .	{ Cleomenes and Sophonisba (sur- named Juliet), . . . . .	{ 1577
" .	Commemoration of Lady Margaret Douglas, . . . . .	1578
Phiston, William,	Lamentation for John Ivelle, . . . . .	1571
" .	Wellspring of Witty Conceits, . . . . .	1584
Plat, Hugh, .	Flowers of Philosophy, etc., . . . . .	1572
Powell, Thomas,	Passionate Poet, . . . . .	1601
Preston, Thomas,	Gillyflower, etc., . . . . .	1569
Pricket, Robert, .	Soldier's Wish to King James, . . . . .	1603
Proctor, Thomas,	Pretty Pamphlets, . . . . .	1578
Puttenham, George,	Partheniades, . . . . .	1579
Ramsey, Laurence,	Farewell to Earl of Leicester, . . . . .	1588
Rankins, William,	Seven Satires, etc., . . . . .	1596
Raynolds, John, .	Dolarny's Primrose, . . . . .	1606
Rice, Richard, .	Invective against Vices, . . . . .	1581
Robinson, Richard,	Reward of Wickedness, . . . . .	1574
Rolland, John, .	Dial of Daily Contemplation, . . . . .	1578
" .	Court of Venus, . . . . .	1575
Rosse, J., . . . . .	Seven Sieges, . . . . .	1578
Rous, Francis, .	Tears for Sir William Sackville, . . . . .	1592
Rowland, Samuel,	Thule; or, Virtue's History, . . . . .	1598
" .	Betraying of Christ, . . . . .	1598
" .	Guy, Earl of Warwick, . . . . .	—
" .	Letting of Humour's Blood, . . . . .	1600
" .	Look to it, for I'll stab ye, . . . . .	1604
" .	Democritus, . . . . .	1607
" .	Humour's Looking-glass, . . . . .	1608
" .	Hell Broke Loose, . . . . .	—
" .	Doctor Merryman, . . . . .	1609
" .	{ Martin Markal (Beadle of Bride- well), . . . . .	{ 1610
" .	{ Knave of Clubs ('Tis Merry when Knaves Meet), . . . . .	{ 1611
" .	Knave of Hearts, . . . . .	—
" .	Knaves of Spades and Diamonds, . . . . .	1613
" .	Melancholy Knight, . . . . .	1615
" .	'Tis Merry when Gossips Meet, . . . . .	—
Sabie, Francis, .	Pan his Pipe (hexameters), . . . . .	1595
" .	Fisherman's Tale (Cassander), . . . . .	1595
" .	Flora's Fortune (Cassander, part 2), . . . . .	1595
Saker, Aug., .	Labyrinth of Liberty, . . . . .	1579
Sampson, Thomas,	{ Fortune's Fashion (Elizabeth Gray, Queen to Edward IV), . . . . .	{ 1613
Sandford, James,	Poems Dedicated to Queen, . . . . .	1576

Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Scoloker, Antony,	Daiphantus; or Passions of Love,	1604
Scot, Gregory, .	Brief Treatise against Rome, .	1570
Scot, Thomas, .	{ Four Paradoxes (of Art, Law, War, Service), . . . . .	1602
Smith, Jud, .	Phylomythie, . . . . .	1616
Smith, William, .	Solomon's Song, . . . . .	1575
Soothern, John, .	Chloris, . . . . .	1596
Stanyhurst, Richard,	Pandora (Diana), . . . . .	1584
Storer, Thomas, .	Virgil's <i>Aeneid</i> , i-iv, etc., . . . . .	1583
Stuart, James I, .	{ Aspiring, Triumph, Death of Wol- sey (3 parts), . . . . .	1599
" .	Essays of a Prentise, . . . . .	1584
Stubbs, Philip, .	Poetical Exercises, . . . . .	1591
Tarlton, Richard,	{ View of Vanity, and Alarum to England, . . . . .	1582
" .	Toys, . . . . .	1576
" .	Tragical Treatises, . . . . .	1577
Taylor, John, .	Tarlton's Repentance, . . . . .	1589
" .	{ Heaven's Blessing, etc. (On Mar- riage of Princess Elizabeth), . . . . .	1613
Tofte, Robert, .	Nipping of Abuses, . . . . .	1614
" .	Two Tales (from Ariosto), . . . . .	1597
" .	Laura (3 parts), . . . . .	1597
" .	{ Orlando Inamorato, i-iii (transla- tion), . . . . .	1598
" .	Alba (Melancholy Lover), . . . . .	1598
" .	Honour's Academy (Julietta), . . . . .	1610
" .	{ Fruits of Jealousy (Two English Lovers), . . . . .	1615
Treego, William,	Dainty Nosegay, . . . . .	1577
Tudor, Queen Elizabeth,	Two Little Anthems, . . . . .	1578
Turner, Richard,	Nosce te (Humors), . . . . .	1607
Twyne, Thomas,	{ Virgil's <i>Aeneid</i> , { xb-xii, I-xa, . . . . .	1573
Phaer, Thomas, .	Nastagio and Traversari (from Italian), . . . . .	1569
Tye, Christopher,	Ovid's Invective against Ibis, . . . . .	1569
Underdown, Thomas, .	Theseus and Ariadne, . . . . .	1566
" .	Tale of Two Swans, . . . . .	1590
Vallans, William,	Miracle of Nature, . . . . .	1601
Vennard, Richard,	Odes (devotional), . . . . .	1601
Verstegan, Richard,	Nursery of Names, . . . . .	1581
Warren, William,	Virgil's Eclogues, i, ii (hexameters),	1586
Webbe, William,	Curan of Danske and Argentill, . . . . .	—
Webster, William,	Godly Songs, . . . . .	1597
Wedderburn, —,	Epigrams, . . . . .	1599
Weever, John, .		



Name of Poet.	Works.	Date of Publication.
Weever, John, .	{ Mirror of Martyrs (Sir John Oldcastle), . . . . .	{ 1601
Wenman, Thomas,	Mary, Queen of Scots, . . . . .	1601
Wharton, John, .	Wharton's Dream, . . . . .	1578
Whetstone, George,	Rock of Regard, . . . . .	1576
Whitney, " Geoffrey,	Virtues of Francis Lord Russell, . . . . .	1585
"	Emblems, . . . . .	1586
Wilkinson, Edward,	Isaac's Inheritance due to James VI of Scotland, . . . . .	{ 1603
Willet, Andrew, .	Sacrorum Emblematum Centura, . . . . .	—
Willymot, William,	Prince's Looking-glass, . . . . .	1603
Wyrley, William,	Lord Chandos, . . . . .	1592
"	Capitall de Buz, . . . . .	1592
Yates, James, .	Castle of Courtesy, . . . . .	1582
Yong, Bartholomew,	{ Diana of George of Montemayer (from Spanish; partly prose), . . . . .	{ 1598
Zouche, Richard,	The Dove (Passages of Cosmography), . . . . .	1613

The titles of the poems are abbreviated in this table, for convenience in printing. They will be found in fuller form in Drake, and unabbreviated in Hazlitt's *Handbook*. The above list is meant, not as a bibliographical account, but as a means of easy reference to the poets' names.

I next give a list of the greater poets who wrote anything before 1616, with the dates of their lives and deaths, and a table showing the periods during which they were contemporaneous. More than this cannot be given here; nor would it be of any use to give mere catalogues of their works, without critical notes as to date, etc. This must be left for a future opportunity. The names with an \* affixed are either added by me to Drake's list, or transferred by me from his list of minor poets to this one.

Poet's Name.	Born.	Died.
Beaumont, Sir John, .	... 1582 . . .	1628
Breton, Nicholas, .	... ?1554 . June 22,	1624
Braithwaite, Richard,*	... 1588 . Mar. 4,	1673
Brooke, Arthur,*	... ? . . .	1628
Browne, William, .	... 1590 . . .	? 1645
Chalkhill, John, .	... ? . . .	?
Chapman, George, .	... 1559 . . .	1634
Churchyard, Thomas,	... ? 1520 . April 4,	1604

Poet's Name.		Born.		Died.
Constable, Henry,	.	... ? 1563	.	... ?
Daniel, Samuel,	.	... 1562	.	Oct. 14, 1619
Davies, Sir John,	.	... 1570	.	Dec. 7, 1626
Davors, John,	.	...	.	... ?
Donne, John,	.	... 1573	.	Mar. 1631
Drayton, Michael,	.	... 1563	.	Dec. 23, 1631
Drummond, William,	.	Dec. 13, 1585	.	Dec. 4, 1649
Dyer, Sir Edward,*	.	...	.	... ?
Fairfax, Edward,	.	... ? 1572	.	... c. 1632
Fitzgeffery, Charles,	.	... c. 1574	.	... 1636-7
Fletcher, Giles,* sen.,	.	... ? 1556	.	... 1610
Fletcher, Giles, jun.,	.	... 1588	.	... 1623
Fletcher, Phineas,	.	... 1585	.	... 1650
Gascoigne, George,	.	... 1537	.	Oct. 7, 1577
Greene, Robert,	.	... ? 1561	.	... 1592
Greville, Fulke, Lord Brooke,*	.	... 1564	.	... 1628
Hall, Joseph,	.	July 1, 1574	.	Sept. 8, 1656
Harington, Sir John,	.	... 1559	.	... 1612
Jonson, Benjamin,	.	... 1573	.	... 1637
Lodge, Thomas,	.	... ? 1556	.	... 1625
Marlow, Christopher,	.	... 1564	.	... 1593
Marston, John,	.	... ? 1575	.	... ? 1611
Niccols Richard,	.	... 1584	.	... ?
Raleigh, Sir Walter,	.	... 1552	.	... 1618
Sackville, Thomas,	.	... 1527	.	April 19, 1608
Shakespeare, William,	.	... 1564	.	... 1616
Sidney, Sir Philip,	.	Nov. 29, 1554	.	Oct. 17, 1586
Southwell, Robert,	.	... 1560	.	Feb. 21, 1595
Spenser, Edmund,	.	... 1552	.	Jan. 16, 1598
Stirling, William Alexander, {	.	... 1580	.	Feb. 12, 1640
Earl of, .	.	...	.	Sept. 28, 1618
Sylvester, Joshua,	.	... 1563	.	...
Turberville, George,	.	... ? 1530	.	... c. 1594
Tusser, Thomas,	.	... c. 1515	.	... c. 1580
Warner, William,	.	... c. 1558	.	Mar. 9, 1608-9
Watson, Thomas,	.	... 1560	.	... 1592
Willolie, Henry,	.	... c. 1565	.	... ?
Wither, George,	.	... 1588	.	... 1667
Wotton, Sir Henry,	.	... 1568	.	Dec. 1639

Poet.	Born.	Died.	155 0 2 4 6 8	156 0 2 4 6 8	157 0 2 4 6 8	
Phaer, . . .	? 1510	1560	.....	.....	.....	1
Tusser, . . .	? 1516	1580	.....	.....	.....	2
Churchyard, . . .	? 1520	1604	.....	.....	.....	3
Sackville, . . .	1527	1608	.....	.....	.....	4
Turberville, . . .	? 1530	? 1594	.....	.....	.....	5
Gascoigne, . . .	1537	1577	.....	.....	.....	6
Stanyhurst, . . .	? 1545	1618	.....	.....	.....	7
Raleigh, . . .	1552	1618	.....	.....	.....	8
Spenser, . . .	1552	1599	.....	.....	.....	9
Sidney, . . .	1554	1586	.....	.....	.....	10
Greville, . . .	1554	1628	.....	.....	.....	11
Lodge, . . .	? 1556	1625	.....	.....	.....	12
Fletcher, Dr G., . . .	1556	1610	.....	.....	.....	13
Warner, . . .	1558	1609	.....	.....	.....	14
Breton, . . .	1558	1624	.....	.....	.....	15
Chapman, . . .	1559	1634	.....	.....	.....	16
Harrington, . . .	1559	1612	.....	.....	.....	17
Watson, . . .	1560	1592	.....	.....	.....	18
Constable, . . .	1560	1612	.....	.....	.....	19
Greene, . . .	? 1561	1592	.....	.....	.....	20
Southwell, . . .	1562	1592	.....	.....	.....	21
Daniel, . . .	1562	1619	.....	.....	.....	22
Drayton, . . .	1563	1627	.....	.....	.....	23
Sylvester, . . .	1563	1618	.....	.....	.....	24
Marlow, . . .	1564	1593	.....	.....	.....	25
Shakespeare, . . .	1564	1616	.....	.....	.....	26
Willowbie, . . .	? 1565	1608	.....	.....	.....	27
Wotton, . . .	1568	1639	.....	.....	.....	28
Davies, Sir John, . . .	? 1570	1626	.....	.....	.....	29
Fairfax, . . .	? 1572	? 1632	.....	.....	.....	30
Donne, . . .	1573	1631	.....	.....	.....	31
Jonson, . . .	1573	1637	.....	.....	.....	32
Hall, . . .	1574	1627	.....	.....	.....	33
Marston, . . .	? 1575	? 1634	.....	.....	.....	34
Davison, . . .	1575	1618	.....	.....	.....	35
Fitzgeffery, . . .	? 1575	1637	.....	.....	.....	36
Sandys, . . .	1577	1644	.....	.....	.....	37
Ancrem, . . .	1578	1652	.....	.....	.....	38
Taylor, . . .	? 1580	1654	.....	.....	.....	39
Stirling, Earl of, . . .	1580	1640	.....	.....	.....	40
Corbet, . . .	1582	1635	.....	.....	.....	41
Beaumont, J., . . .	1582	1628	.....	.....	.....	42
Fletcher, P., . . .	1582	1650	.....	.....	.....	43
Niccols, . . .	1584	after 1615	.....	.....	.....	44
Drummond, . . .	1585	1649	.....	.....	.....	45
Fletcher, G., . . .	? 1588	1623	.....	.....	.....	46
Wither, . . .	? 1588	1667	.....	.....	.....	47
Carew, . . .	? 1590	1639	.....	.....	.....	48
Browne, . . .	1590	1645	.....	.....	.....	49
King, . . .	1591	1669	.....	.....	.....	50
Herrick, . . .	1591	1674	.....	.....	.....	51
Quarles, . . .	1592	1644	.....	.....	.....	52
Herbert, . . .	1593	1633	.....	.....	.....	53

	158	159	160	161	162	163
1	o 2 4	6 8	o 2 4	6 8	o 2 4	6 8
2	-					
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39	.					
40	.					
41	..					
42	..					
43						
44	..			..		
45	..					
46	..					
47	..					
48	..					
49	..					
50	..					
51	..					
52	..					
53	..					

In addition to the works of individuals mentioned above, there are various composite works, on which the undergiven particulars will be found useful by the student. The *Mirror for Magistrates* was published (edited by W. Baldwin) in 1558 (1st edition); eight new legends were added in 1563 (2d edition); it was reprinted in 1571 (3d edition), 1575 (4th edition), 1578 (5th edition), with two new legends, and a second part of twelve new stories, added by Thomas Blenner-Hasset.

But the first issue was also distinguished by the title of the last part after 1575, in which year Higgins published his so-called first part (this name being assumed on account of its treating of themes historically earlier). A second edition of Higgins's first part appeared in 1578. In 1587 the two works were united, including altogether 73 legends; and finally, in 1610, Niccols further enlarged it to 90 legends, and added *England's Eliza*. The contributors to the original book were Sackville, Earl of Dorset, Richard Baldwyne, George Ferrers, Churchyard, Phayer, Skelton, Dolman, Seagers, and Cavyl.

Of collections of shorter poems the following are noteworthy:

1. *Songs and Sonnets (Tottel's Miscellany)*. The dates of the editions are: (1) 5th June 1557; (2) with 39 new poems, 31st July 1557; (3) 1559; (4) 1565; (5) 1567; (6) 1574,— all printed by R. Tottel; (7) 1585, by J. Windet; (8) 1587, by R. Robinson.

The contributors were: Earl of Surrey (40 poems), Sir Thomas Wyatt (96), Nicholas Grimald (40), Thomas Churchyard, Thomas Lord Vaux (2), Edward Somerset (1), John Heywood (1), and Sir Francis Brian. 130 poems are still unassigned. The total number is 310.

2. *Paradise of Dainty Devises*, collected by R. Edwards. Editions: (1) Printed by Henry Disle, 1576; (2) 1577; (3) with poem by G. Whetstone, 1578; (4) with eighteen new poems substituted for others, 1580; (5) 1585; (6) with seven new poems in place of four old ones, 1596; (7) 1600. The last two editions were printed for Ed. White. There is also an edition without date, by E. Al[llde], for Ed. White.

The contributors were: R. Edwards (14 poems), S. Barnarde, Earl of Oxford (7), Lord Vaux (14), D. Sand (5), Jasper Heywood (8), F. Kinwelmarsh (10), M. Bew (5), R. Hill (7), A. Yloop [Pooly] (2), W. Hunnis (13), A. Bourcher (1), M. Candish (1), T. Churchyard (1), G. Gaske (1), L. Lloyd (1), T. Marshall (2), B. Riche (1), M. Thorn (2), My Luck is

Loss [G. Gascoigne] (5); with initials, H. D. (1), R. D. (1), M. D. (1), F. G[reville] (1), R. L. (1), F. M. (5), E. S. (5), M. S. (1); anonymous (7)—total, 129.

3. *Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*. Printed for Rich. Jones, 1578. Edited by [Owen Royden and] T[homas] P[roctor]. Contributed to by Antony Munday. Only two copies known. There are 74 poems in all.

4. *Handful of Pleasant Delights*. Printed by Rich. Jones, 1584. Edited by Clement Robinson. Other contributors: Leonard Gibson (1 poem), J. Tomson (2), Peter Picks (2), Thomas Richardson (1), George Mannington (1). Only one copy known; it contains 32 poems.

5. *Phænix Nest*. Printed by John Jackson, 1593. Edited by R. S. Only two copies known. 79 poems.

6. *England's Helicon*. Printed by I. R., for John Flasket, 1600 (containing 150 poems); and for Rich. More, 1614 (with 159 poems). [Edited by J. Bodenham.]

7. *Love's Martyr; or, Rosalin's Complaint*. Translated by Robert Chester from Torquato Cæliano, with the *Legend of King Arthur*, and *Essays on the Turtle and Phænix* by Shakespeare, Jonson, Marston, and Chapman, 1601.

8. *Poetical Rhapsody*. Edited by Francis and William Davison. Editions: 1602, 1608, 1611, 1621.

To these may be added two collections of poetical quotations.

9. *England's Parnassus*. 1600. Collected by Robert Allott. Printed for N. L., C. B., and T. H.

10. *Belvedere; or, The Garden of the Muses*. Printed by F. K. for Hugh Astley, 1600. Edited by John Bodenham. There was another edition in 1610.

Besides these there were collections of madrigals, songs, etc., by William Boyd, 1587; Thomas Morley, 1598, 1601; John Wilbye, Thomas Weekes, John Dowland, Robert Jones, 1609, 1610; Nicholas Young, 1588, 1597; and Orlando Gibbons, 1612.

The contributors to 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 can be given most succinctly in tabular form as in the next page. A star (\*) indicates the collection to which the writer contributed; a numeral the number of poems contributed by him; and initial letters, a signature which may be probably assigned to the author opposite to whose name it occurs.

POET.	Phœnix Nest.	Helicon (189 poems, 16 anon.).	Parnassus.	Belvidere.	Rhapsody.
Achelly, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Barnefield, Richard, . . . . .	..	2	..	*	..
Bastard, Thomas, . . . . .	..	1 T. B.	*	*	..
Best, Charles, . . . . .	..	5 E. B.	..	*	..
Bolton, Edmund, . . . . .	..	8	..	*	..
Breton, Nicholas, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Brooke, Christopher, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Browne, William, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Campion, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Chapman, George, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Churchyard, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Constable, Henry, . . . . .	..	4 H. C.	*	*	H. C.
Daniel, Samuel, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Davies, Sir John, . . . . .	..	1 I. D.	..	*	..
Davison, Francis, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Dekkar, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Derby, Ferdinand, Earl of, . . . . .	..	5	..	*	..
Drayton, Michael, . . . . .	..	6 S.E.D.	* F.G.	*	..
Dyer, Sir Edward, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Fairfax, Edmund (F.'s <i>Godfrey</i> ), . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Fitzgeffery, Charles, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Ford, John, . . . . .	..	1 I. F.	..	*	..
Fraunce, Abraham, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Gascoigne, George, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Gilpin, Edward, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..
Greene, Robert, . . . . .	..	7	..	*	R. G.
Greville, Fulke (?), . . . . .	..	2 M.F.G.	..	*	..
Gough, John, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Harrington, Sir John, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Herbert, Sir William, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Higgins, John, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Hindlemarsh, Francis, . . . . .	..	2	..	*	..
Howard, Earl of Surrey, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Howell, M. N. [Nowell], . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Hudson, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Hunnis, William, . . . . .	..	2 W. H.	..	*	..
James, King of Scots, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Jonson, Benjamin, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Kyd, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Locke, Henry, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Lodge, Thomas, . . . . .	16	10	..	*	..
Markham, Gervase, . . . . .	..	2 I. M.	..	*	..
Marlow, Christopher, . . . . .	..	1	..	*	..
Marston, John, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Middleton, Christopher, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Nash, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Norton, Thomas, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Oxford, Earl of, . . . . .	E. O.	1	* E.O.	*	..
Peele, George, . . . . .	G. P.	3	..	*	..
Pembroke, Mary, Countess of, . . . . .	..	..	..	*	..
Raleigh, Sir Walter (? Ignoto), . . . . .	..	14?	?	*	W. R.
Roydon, Matthew, . . . . .	*	..	*	*	..
Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, . . . . .	..	..	*	*	..

POET.			Phœnix Nest.		Parnassus.		Belvidere.	Rhapsody.
Shakespeare, William,	.	.		2				
Sidney, Sir Philip,	.	.	W. S.	14	* : * : * : * :			
Smith, William,	.	.		1 W.S.	: * : * : * :			
Spelman, Thomas,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Spenser, Edmund,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Storer, Thomas,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Sylvester, Joshua,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Tonie, Shepherd,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Turberville, George,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Warner, William,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Watson, Thomas,	.	.	T. W.		* : * : * : * :			
Weever, John,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Weever, William,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Whetstone, George,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Willet, Andrew,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Wilmot, Robert,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Winchester, Marquis of,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Wotton, Henry,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Wyatt, Sir Thomas,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			
Young, Bartholomew,	.	.			* : * : * : * :			

The following final table gives a rough classification of the chief poets as to the subject-matter of their best writings (chiefly from Drake).

	Narrative.	Sonnets.	Pastoral.	Satires.	Lyric.	Didactic.	Translations.	Allegoric.
Sackville,	*							
Higgins,	*							
Niccols,	*							
Warner,	*							
Shakespeare,	*							
Daniel,	*							
Drayton,	*							
Fitzgeffery,	*							
Storer,	*							
Willbbie,	*							
Beaumont, J.,	*							
Marlow,	*							
Fletcher, G., sen.,	*							
Spenser,	*							
Sidney,	*							
Constable,	*							

		Narrative.	Sonnets.	Pastoral.	Satires.	Lyric.	Didactic.	Translations.	Allegoric.
Watson,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Barnes,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Barnefield,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Smith,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Stirling,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Drummond,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Browne,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chalkhill,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fairfax,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fletcher, P.,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lodge,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Hall,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Marston,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Donne,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wither,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Gascoigne,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Greene,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Raleigh,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Breton,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Jonson,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wotton,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tusser,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Davies,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fletcher, G.,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Davors,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chapman,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Harrington,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sylvester,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..
Golding,	.	..	.....*	..	..	..	..	..	..

## SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

DURING the passing of the foregoing chapters through the press, I have succeeded in obtaining additional illustrations and results of research, which I here append:

I. *Note on p. 18.*—The following table of five lists of 'heroines' from Chaucer and Lydgate will be useful for reference.

NAME OF HEROINE.	Legend of Good Women.	Ballad in Prologue to Good Women.	Prologue to Man of Law's Tale.	Ovid's Heroines.	Lydgate's Flower of Courtesy.
Cleopatra,	1	9	[18]	...	4
Thisbe,	2	10	3	...	...
Dido,	3	12	4	7	17
Hypsipyle,	4	16	9	6	15
Medea,	4	...	14	12	18
Lucretia,	5	7	2	...	12
Ariadne,	6	18	8	10	11
Philomela,	7	...	[19]	...	...
Phyllis,	8	14	5	2	14
Hypermnestra,	9	17	15	14	...
Esther,	...	1	...	...	6
Penelope,	...	2	16	1	13
Marcia Catonis,	...	3	...	...	9
Ysoude,	4	...	...	...	...
Lavinia,	6	...	...	...	...
Polyxena,	8	...	...	...	1
Laodamia,	...	13	13	13	...
Helen,	...	5	11	16	2
Hero,	...	11	10	17	...
Canace,	...	15	*	11	16
Hermione,	...	...	7	8	...
Deianeira,	...	...	6	9	...
Briseis,	...	...	12	5	...
Alcestis,	...	...	17	...	8
Alcyone,	...	...	1	...	...
Antiochus' daughter,	...	...	*	...	...
Phoedra,	...	...	...	4	...
Sappho,	...	...	...	15	...
Cydippe,	...	...	18	...	...
Dorigen,	...	...	...	...	3
Grissel,	...	...	...	...	10
Antigone,	...	...	...	...	5
Judith,	...	...	...	...	7
OEnone,	...	...	5	...	...

2. *Note on p. 44.*—The following extract from Holinshed will confirm the conclusion in the text, and illustrate the *Miller's Tale*:

'1382. A lewd fellow that took upon him to be skilful in physic and astronomy, caused it to be published through the city of London, that upon the Ascension Even there would rise such a pestilent planet that all those which came abroad forth of their chambers, before they had said five times the Lord's Prayer, commonly called the Pater Noster, and did not eat somewhat that morning before their going forth, should be taken with sickness and suddenly die thereof.'

3. *Note on the Pastoral Names, pp. 85, 90.*—CUDDIE (Cutty) is an abbreviation of Christopher, not of Cuthbert, as commonly supposed. The Cutty of William Brown is Christopher Brooke; but who Spenser's Cuddy is, is very doubtful. On negative grounds, Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, is most likely the man, for it is not probable that Spenser would omit him altogether in his shepherd list, and there is no other character that can be identified with him.

PALINODE and PALIN.—No doubt these are identical. Malone's idea that the name is taken from George Peele's *Eclogue*, 1589, is refuted by the fact of Spenser's using the name ten years before Peele's poem was written. Moreover, Piers, and not Palinode (or Palin; both forms are used by Peele), is Peele himself in his eclogue. No doubt, however, Peele did take the names from Spenser, but assigned them to different persons.

CORYDON.—With all deference to Malone, Todd, and Mr Grosart, who says 'we all agree' that Corydon is Abraham Fraunce, Corydon is Edward Dyer. It was his own self-chosen pastoral name (*see* Mr Grosart's valuable edition of his works). The Corydon of A. Fraunce, on whom the commentators rely, is only the Corydon of Virgil's *Eclogue*, which Fraunce translated, and not an Elizabethan at all. Dyer was not knighted till 1596; hence there is no ground for supposing him to be other than 'meanly waged'; and the notion of Spenser calling Fraunce 'the tallest wit of most I know this day,' is too absurd even for a joke. The name of Corydon was also assumed by Richard Barnefield and Nicholas Breton. In one of Barnaby Googe's eclogues, a Corydon complains of a later Corydon, sprung 'from the cart,' starting up in his place. But Googe's Corydons are, I think, ecclesiastics, and not pastoral writers.

HARPALUS.—Certainly the Harpalus of the pastoral re-

ferred to by Malone. That poem occurs in Tottel's *Miscellany* anonymously, but also in *England's Helicon*, followed by another, 'written in answer' on the same subject, by Shepherd Tonie. These answers were usually written by the same persons as the original poems. Tonie has been identified with Antony Munday, chiefly because no other known Antony is likely to have written so well. In any case the story of Harpalus fits well with Googe's life. Before he married Mary Darrell, he was rejected by a Mrs A., to whom he wrote some verses on the occasion. This Mrs A. is Phyllida if Googe be Harpalus.

ALCON.—Surely not Lodge. Drayton's pastoral name for James, King of England, is Olcon (as is clear on comparison of his eighth *Eclogue*, with his letter to George Sandys). Alcon is only another and more accurate spelling of Olcon. I take Alcon, then, to be James VI, King of Scots, author of the *Essays of a Prentise in the Divine Art of Poesy*.

AMYNTAS.—Mr Arber, in one of his valuable reprints, claims this name for Watson. But Malone is right. Watson's Amyntas is in love with Phyllis. Spenser's Amyntas is bewailed by Amaryllis, who is certainly Alice, wife of Ferdinand, Lord Derby. Moreover, Watson's poem is only a translation or adaptation of Tasso's *Aminta*. Pastoral names are not given on ground of translation.

ALEXIS.—It appears from Drummond's poems that Alexis, as a pastoral name, is used as an abbreviation of Alexander. Whether Alexander Neville is here indicated, I am uncertain.

*Note on p. 62 of 'Introduction to Shakespearian Study.'*—There is an error in this page, caused by my following the introduction to *Chapman's Works* (three vols., Chatto and Windus). The author of that able essay has, no doubt, used the translation of Raumer's *Briefe aus Paris*, in which the ambassador's letter is given, with date 1606; or else has referred to some other authority who has used it. I find in the original work the date rightly given as 1608. Again, Mr Grosart states that Jonson was accused of popery and treason by Northampton before the council, on account of his *Sejanus*. That would be then his 'former error,' and his imprisonment for *Eastward Ho* his second one. The statement in my text must therefore be modified. Read 1608 for 1605, and delete paragraph 'It is difficult . . . in that year.'

## LIST OF EDITIONS OF SPENSER'S WORKS.

Work.	Printer.	Publisher.	Date.
<i>Theater for World-lings,</i> . . . . .	Henry Bynneman,	. . . . .	1569.
<i>Shepherd's Calendar,</i> . . . . .	Hugh Singleton, . . . . .	. . . . .	1579. Q. 1.
"	Thomas East, . . . . .	John Harrison, . . . . .	1581. Q. 2.
"	John Wolfe, . . . . .	" . . . . .	1586. Q. 3.
"	John Windet, . . . . .	" . . . . .	1591. Q. 4.
"	Thomas Creede, . . . . .	" . . . . .	1597. Q. 5.
<i>Complaints,</i> . . . . .		William Ponsonby, . . . . .	1591. Q. 1.
<i>Daphnaida,</i> . . . . .		" . . . . .	1591. Q. 1.
<i>Colin Clout,</i> . . . . .		" . . . . .	1595. Q. 1.
<i>Amoretti, etc.,</i> . . . . .	P. S., . . . . .	" . . . . .	1595. Q. 1.
<i>Prothalamion,</i> . . . . .		" . . . . .	1596. Q. 1.
<i>Four Hymns,</i> . . . . .		" . . . . .	1596. Q. 1.
<i>Fairy Queen</i> (i-iii), (Entd. Dec. 1, 1589), (i-vi), . . . . .	(Entd. Dec. 1, 1589), . . . . .	" . . . . .	Jan. 23, 1590. Q. 1.
"	H. L., . . . . .	Matthew Lowndes, . . . . .	1596. Q. 2.
<i>Works,</i> . . . . .	" . . . . .	" . . . . .	1609. F. 1.
"	H. Hills, . . . . .	Jonathan Edwin, . . . . .	1611. F. 2.
"			1617. F. 3.
			1679. F. 4.
<i>Three Letters</i> (Spenser & Harvey), . . . . .	H. Bynnemann, . . . . .	. . . . .	1580. Q. 1.
<i>Two Letters</i> (By the same), . . . . .	" . . . . .	. . . . .	1580. Q. 1.
<i>View of the State of Ireland,</i> . . . . .		(Dublin,) . . . . .	1633. F. 1.

## AFTER-WORDS ON THE STUDY OF THE OLDER ENGLISH POETS AND DRAMATISTS.

THE publishers having kindly placed a few extra pages at my disposal, I seize the opportunity of stating my views on the desirability of the introduction of more extended studies of English literature into the ordinary course of education in our secondary schools. It is somewhat strange that one whose chief efforts during the period of twenty years have been devoted to the introduction of physical science into our grammar schools, should now be an advocate of a somewhat opposite method, but it must be remembered that since 1856 circumstances have greatly changed. The natural sciences at that date were almost entirely neglected. No tolerable text-books fit for school purposes existed in the English language ; no reasonable methods of conveying instruction were in use ; mathematics and classics formed the whole practical curriculum, and the usual result of some eight to ten years' education was that a pupil left school with a capability of writing intolerably bad Latin verse, a disgust with the great authors of pagan antiquity, and an incapability of taking up seriously any of the scientific subjects of investigation that are rendered imperatively necessary by the needs of modern civilisation. At present the danger is that the sciences concerned with material nature may become all-absorbing ; that the higher culture concerned with man's artistic faculties may be entirely neglected ; and that, in our search for truth, we may lose our perception of beauty.

The study of the masterpieces of Greece and Rome will undoubtedly fall into increasing neglect except in our higher or first grade schools, and even in them will only be pursued with advantage by the few who are looking forward to an extended course of study at the universities. It will become more and more a speciality, as the study of the masterpieces of the Sanscrit literature has always been. But then for the many (and I speak here only of and for them, I say nothing as to exceptional instances) this will involve a serious loss. However the teaching of classics may have been abused (and it has been greatly abused) in our secondary instruction, it

must not be forgotten that it was the only artistic culture that we have hitherto possessed ; that losing it we shall lose all that tended to excite in us a love of the beautiful, unless we replace it by an equivalent ; and, moreover, that in it we sacrifice the only thoroughly organised means of training that we had attained. For, in spite of the well-directed efforts of the last few years, the methods used in teaching the natural sciences are still far behind those of the older subjects in exactness, in largeness of grasp, and in power of enforcing a general recognition of any one systematised plan.

Since, then, the study of the ancients must be replaced by some equivalent, where shall we find any other study so fit to replace them as that of our own elder literature ? That literature is of an extent and value inferior to none ; it contains in it as excellent material for fostering the imagination and developing the reason as any in the world ; it is of sufficient extent to occupy those who can give a lifetime to its study, and it has a sufficiency of acknowledged masterpieces to allow a selection to be made, small enough for the most limited curriculum that can be afforded by those who are pressed by the business exactions of our feverish times. It has also the advantage that boys (and girls too) like it as a study ; it never induces the lassitude and disgust with study in general that the classical authors too often caused in young pupils.

But then it must be taken up as a serious part of our training. Just as twenty years since some half-dozen lectures on chemistry used to be given in schools as a yearly course, in order that the managers might allege that scientific studies were not neglected ; so now it is a fashion to take a book of *Paradise Lost*, or a play of Shakespeare, to cram the pupil with the notes of some special edition with a few extra annotations from the teacher, and to call this a course of English literature. This will, of course, mend in time ; and it is to urge on this amendment that the present series of text-books has been entered on. The points specially kept in view, because they are often neglected, are the following :

1. If possible, a period of literature should be studied as a whole, along with contemporary politics, manners, and historical events.
2. Not only the life of the special author whom we are studying, but also those of his friends, rivals, and otherwise connected contemporaries, should be carefully examined.
3. The works of any author should be read in the order in which they were written, and with reference to his contemporaries.

4. No doubtful critical point should ever be set before the student as ascertained. One great advantage of these studies is the acquirement of a power of forming a judgment in cases of conflicting evidence. Give the student the evidence; state your own opinion if you like, but let him judge for himself.

5. No extracts or incomplete works should be used. The capability of appreciating a whole work as a whole, is one of the principal aims in æsthetic culture.

6. It is better to read thoroughly one simple play or poem, than to know details about all the dramatists and poets. The former trains the brain to judge of other plays or poems. The latter only loads the memory with details that can at any time be found when required, in books of reference. Hence sketches of universal history and summary views of a country's literature, are inevitably failures if they aspire to be more than tables of reference. This kind of surface knowledge is much encouraged by our present methods of teaching and examination, and I regret to see that many text-books written by men of no small ability are fostering the evil.

7. It is highly desirable that along with the study of any great work, some secondary contemporary work on the same or a similar subject, should be combined. Our present practice of confining our pupils to the very highest authors, is a mistake. It gives them no data for comparison, and prevents their forming a sufficiently high estimate of our best men.

8. It is not desirable to do too much for our pupils. No man likes to be treated as a child, and no boy likes to have done for him what he can readily do for himself. I have seen in some text-books long quotations from the Old Testament given in full. Better give a reference and let the boy turn it up. Similarly in other matters.

9. For these studies to completely succeed, they must be as thorough as our classical studies used to be. No difficult point in syntax, prosody, accidente, or pronunciation; no variation in manners or customs, no historical or geographical allusion, must be passed over without explanation. This training in exactness will not interfere with, but aid the higher aims of literary training.

Leaving these specialities on one side, let us now look a little to higher matters. If it is necessary that literary culture should be given in all schools, which point we may, I trust, take for granted, and if it is advisable that this culture

should be derived from our English literature, which I hope few will deny, why dwell on poets and dramatists, rather than on essayists and historians? Are not Bacon and Macaulay better reading for the young, than Shakespeare and Spenser? I venture to think not. One great aim we should have in view in selecting authors for this purpose, is to produce by their perusal in the minds of our pupils as vivid a picture of some historical period as we can. For this purpose nothing can compare with dramatic productions. No descriptive or narrative writing will ever equal in vividness and power of impression a really good play. Not only is it more lifelike, from the very nature of its form, bringing before us actual men and women, instead of talk about them; but it is always the exultant expression of the most characteristic forces that at any given period have been acting on humanity. The baseness of the later Stuart age is as clearly shown in the comedies then fashionable, as the nobleness of the time of Pericles in the great Athenian tragedies. From *Sakontala* and *Solomon's Song* down to *Rabagas* and *La Grande Duchesse*, there is no time worth studying at all, which cannot be best studied in its plays. If all other literature were destroyed, the most important facts in the history of a people could be restored from them, and in many instances from them only. Directly in the historical drama, indirectly in every turn of thought and allusion to passing event or changing custom, they are the best preparative for the highest study of mankind—the history of itself. They are also the best training for thinking and for expressing our thoughts. The condensation necessitated by stage requirements, which will not tolerate long speeches or monopoly of scenes by single characters, supply an admirable corrective to the idle volubility of the modern novel, and the empty rhetoric of the newspaper leader. Novels and periodicals, however useful both may be, in many respects are corrupting our modern style, even to our letter-writing. Where the professed object is to fill a certain number of pages, regardless of the amount of matter to be expressed in them, the result must be—padding, and padding is injurious to author and reader alike. Early habits of concise expression are absolutely necessary if the next generation is to avoid this crying evil; and these habits will be, I am convinced, strongly encouraged by careful study of our best dramas.

If, on the other hand, we wish not so much to ascertain the general character of any particular age, as to see what was the highest point to which humanity attained in it, then

we must extend our studies so as to include all poets, dramatic or other. Of all the arts, poetry is the one which most accurately furnishes us with a test of individual greatness. Take for instance the following names : Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, Jonson, Fletcher, Massinger, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Cowper, Wordsworth, Shelley, Tennyson, Browning ; think of the history of the times before, during, and after their careers, and I think it will be manifest, not only that the poet is the measure of his age, but also that he is the outcome of a time of stirring action, and the precursor or prophet of a general change in the method of man's thought. And this holds good in exact proportion to his greatness. Armadas and revolutions are contemporaneous with Spensers and Miltos, while new philosophies are preceded by Shakespeares and Shelleys. But I am going beyond my subject, and entering one unfit for these narrow limits. I will conclude with one practical reflection which has been strongly impressed on me in the course of my own teaching. When I was a schoolboy, a great delight was felt by schoolboys generally in reading our poetical literature. I know we read it too cursorily to feel all its beauty, and too indiscriminately to avoid a large amount of trash. Still we did read it. The boys I have known of late years do not read it at all. The modern sensational novel has taken its place. Not that we did not read novels, but somehow Scott, Marryat, and Dickens did not absorb us and prevent our reading anything else : whereas I find that boys who read Jules Verne, Mayne Reid, and the innumerable writers for boys, who deal in thrilling narrative, seem to lose their taste for any wholesome literature, as much as the brandy-drinker or opium-smoker does for his daily food. And besides this, they in many cases lose their sense of humour ; they get into the habit of reading merely for the plot ; this is nearly always of the most exciting kind in the books they read ; hence they are anxious for the *dénouement*, and read hurriedly : all beauties of style or construction are consequently lost on them. I might show how the multiplication of cheap books and the establishment of numerous libraries has aided to increase this tendency, but I trust I have said enough, if not to convince my readers that it is desirable to encourage the reading of our poetic and dramatic literature by the young as a study, as well as for diversion, at any rate to induce them to think the matter over for themselves. If they will do this I feel convinced that innumerable other considerations will arise in their minds, for which I cannot here give

room, and many more which have not occurred to me at all, but all tending in the same direction, and that they will conclude, as I have done (after many years' practical work in this matter as a teacher), that there is no need more urgent at the present moment in our education, than the encouraging in every way we can of the study of literature (especially of our own) before it is entirely supplanted and destroyed by the equally, but not more than equally, important study of the exacter, and, therefore, more material and less human 'natural' sciences.









14 DAY USE  
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED  
**LOAN DEPT.**

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or  
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

NOV 28 1966 7 6

(N)

RECEIVED

DEC 11 1968 6 9

NOV 28 '66 - 9 PM

LOAN DEPT.

RECEIVED

RECEIVED 6 0

DEC 6 '68 - 2 PM

JAN 24 '67 - 7 PM

LOAN DEPT.

LOAN DEPT.

MAY 2 1971

SEP 3 1968 4 8

REG. CIR.

MAY 2 77

RECEIVED

AUG 30 '68 - 8 AM

MAY 11 1978

DEC 11 1976

REG. CIR.

APR 17 '78

YA 03501

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C046614417

9262  
F69

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

